

DRAMA
IN
SANSKRIT LITERATURE

BY
R. V. JAGIRDAR, M. A. (London)
Karnatak College, Dharwar.

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
BOMBAY 7

1947

Price Rs. 8-4-0

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

1. Introduction to the Comparative Philology of Modern Indo-Aryan Languages, 1932.

ORIENTAL BOOK AGENCY, POONA.

2. Gitāgāmbhīrya—Original Thesis in Kannada on Bhāgavata, 1940.

POONGA-MANGA PRAKASHAN, DHARWAR.

3. Human or Superhuman—play in three acts based on Rāmāyaṇa, 1947

POONGA-MANGA PRAKASHAN, DHARWAR.

All rights reserved by the author.

PREFACE

Three reasons have made me write this book.

1. I am a student and ardent admirer of *Sanskrit* literature.
2. In my own language and province I have been a dramatist of some reputation and have fifteen years' experience of producing and acting plays, and,
3. After '*Sanskrit Drama*,' that readable and authoritative volume of the late Dr. A. B. Keith, there has been no work dealing generally with the history of *Sanskrit* drama

It would be presumptuous to disregard as trifling or insignificant the contribution which the Western and our critics have made to the study of the *Sanskrit* Drama. But their pioneering enthusiasm should not obscure us to the fact that dramatic criticism in *Sanskrit* has so far proceeded on such orthodox lines that the last seventy or eighty years appear to have added but little to our understanding of the greatness of the classical tradition or the significance of individual plays either as works of art or as stages of development of the dramatic art. (The fact that the *Sanskrit* plays possess a poetic splendour all their own seems to have weighed so heavily on the minds of the critics that invariably the more significant fact that they are plays first and poetry next has either been ignored or forgotten.) We would be paying but a poor compliment to our dramatists if we merely treated them as purveyors of the epic or traditional stories with some embellishments. That they had something definite of their own to convey through rearrangements or modifications of the age-old stories should therefore be assumed as a preliminary to an appreciation of the special contribution of each single dramatist, and the critic, if he is insightful enough, will find in the end that his assumptions will be amply substantiated and proved. The same has to be said about what little has been done in evolving a consistent account of the growth and development of *Sanskrit* Drama. Dependence on scanty internal evidence has led to unending controversy. It has never even been suspected that a close examination of the growth of dramatic technique may throw a good deal of light on the course of the development of the pre-classical and classical drama. In the main I have approached the subject from these

points of view and I am sure some of my conclusions will offend the orthodox critic. Yet I do not consider the present work as a study, either complete or satisfactory. It is my intention to complete it by another volume dealing with the stage, the production etc., in ancient and mediæval India and to bring the story of the Indian Stage upto the modern times.

In writing the following chapters I have depended mostly on *Sanskrit* originals. Dealing mainly with the history of the art of drama I have not troubled myself with the vexed question of the dates of the various dramatists. Nevertheless, the order in which I have dealt with the individual dramatists represents, in my view, the chronological order of those dramatists.

I must add one word about the quotations from original *Sanskrit*. I have preferred the Roman script (but avoided giving Devanāgarī side by side, for want of space) since that reaches both Indian and foreign readers.

Some chapters of this book were written as early as ten years ago. Some of them appeared in journals to all of which I am thankful.

To my friends, Prof. V. M. Inamdar and Sjt. H. S. Patil, goes the entire credit of seeing the book from the preparation of the manuscript to the preparation of the index and through the press. But for their enthusiasm the publication would not have been as desirable as it certainly claims to be.

I must thank all those readers, friends and actor-collaborators of mine who never suspected that I would learn in their company, if not at their cost. To my students in the college also my thanks are due for what I have learnt while teaching them *Sanskrit* poetry, *Sanskrit* rhetorics and *Sanskrit* Drama.

My heartiest thanks are due to one of my friends and sympathisers but for whose timely and liberal help the book could never have been published.

January 1947
Dharwar

}

R. V. JAGIRDAR

WORKS REFERRED TO WITH THEIR ABBREVIATIONS

R. V.	: R̥gveda.
S. V.	: Sāmaveda.
Y. V.	: Yajurveda.
A. V.	: Atharvaṇaveda.
Mbh.	: Mahābhārata.
Rām.	: Rāmāyaṇa.
N. S.	: Nāṭya Śāstra (Kāshī Sk. Series).
D. R.	: Daśarūpakam.
S. D.	: Sāhityadarpaṇa.
M. S.	: Manusmṛti.
C. H. I.	: Cambridge History of India.
G. E. I.	: Great Epics of India.
Bib Drama.	: Bibliography of Sanskrit Drama (Columbia University : Indo-Iranian Series, Vol. III).
Skt. Drama.	: The Sanskrit Drama by late Professor A. B. Keith.
Brit. Drama.	: British Drama by A. Nicolls.
Ind. Theat.	: The Indian Theatre by E. P. Horowitz.

BHĀSA'S PLAYS :

Prat.	: Pratimā
Abhi.	: Abhiṣekanāṭaka.
Bal.	: Bālacarita
S. V.	: Svapnavāsavadatta.
P. Y.	: Pratijñā Yaugandharāyaṇa.
P. R.	: Pañcarātra.
M. V.	: Madhyamavyāyoga.
D. V.	: Dūtavākya.
D. G.	: Dūtaghaṭotkaca.
K. B.	: Karpabhāra.
U. B.	: Ūrubhaṅga.
Cār.	: Cārudatta.
Avi.	: Avimāraka

KALIDĀSA'S PLAYS :

A. Śāk.	: Abhiññānaśākuntalam.
Vik.	: Vikramorvaśiyam.
Mālav.	: Mālavikāgnimitram.
Mṛchh.	: Mṛchhakatikam of Śūdraka.

BHAVABHŪTI'S PLAYS :

M. V. C.	: Mahāvīracantam.
M. M.	: Mālatī Mādhavam.
U. R.	: Uttararāmacantam.

SRI HARṢA'S PLAYS :

P. D.	: Pnyadarśikā.
Nāg	: Nāgānandam.
Rat	: Ratnāvalī
M. R	: Mudrārākṣasam of Viśākhadatta.
V. S	: Veṇīśaṅhāram of Bhattanārāyaṇa.
K. M	: Kundamālā.
A. R.	: Anargha-Rāghava.
Pras. R.	: Prasanna-Rāghava.
Prab. C.	: Prabodha Candrodaya.
K. M	: Karpūra Mañjarī.
B. B	: Bālabhārata.
Sub. D.	: Subhadrā-Dhanañjaya.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE	iii
LIST OF WORKS WITH THEIR ABBREVIATIONS ..	v
I. GROWTH OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE	3
II. FORM OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE . . .	11
III. ORIGIN OF SANSKRIT DRAMA (TRADITIONAL) ..	20
IV. WHO IS BHARATA?	27
V. RELIGION AND DRAMA	32
VI. DUMB SHOW AND DRAMATIC REPRESENTATION ..	37
VII. ORIGIN OF SANSKRIT DRAMA (<i>contd.</i>) .. .	42
VIII. THE EARLY STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT	45
IX. PLOT DEVELOPMENT IN SANSKRIT PLAYS ..	52
X. THE VIDUṢAKA	64
XI. EARLY PLAYS (BHĀSA)	73
XII. MAIN TENDENCIES	79
XIII. KĀLIDĀSA	88
XIV. THE MṚCCHAKATĪKA OF ŚCUDRAKA ..	101
XV. THE DOCTRINAIRE DRAMA	110
XVI. THE PLAYS OF KING ŚRI HARṢA	122
XVII. A REVIVAL	132
XVIII. THE NEW TOUCH	140
XIX. EPICS AND SANSKRIT DRAMA	150
XX. THE END	157
APPENDIX I. CĀRUDATTA AND MRCHHAKATĪKA ..	161
INDEX	165

• D R A M A
IN
SANSKRIT
LITERATURE

•

CHAPTER I

GROWTH OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE

The scope of the following pages is extremely limited. An attempt will be made to survey that part of Sanskrit Literature which pertains to Drama in the popular sense of that word. The survey would be many-sided : Sanskrit Drama in theory, in practice, in its relations to contemporary social conditions and its place in Literature in general and so on. Thus a study of Sanskrit Literature itself, though in outlines, would be essential to start with. That study forms the background for the present work (Sanskrit Drama is one of the chief aspects of Sanskrit Literature.)

To enable the readers to follow our thesis it will have to be explained at the outset as to what is meant by Literature. For our purposes Literature means two things. (1) Literature is life—Life understood as a vital force always working through and in relation to its surroundings. In this sense Literature is far wider in its scope as well as in its form. In trees and in flowers budding in spring or fading in autumn, in rivers flowing and in seas surging, in the rustling of wind and in the singing of birds, equally as in the behaviour of Man is embedded Life's Literature. Life expressed, Life interpreted, Life asserted and Life made living—all this is Literature. To a man of routine life, however, such a literature is denied in its freshness. (2) Thus arises the second meaning of Literature, viz., the work of Poets. A poet is one who has seen Life as expression, accommodation and assimilation and who holds out for others, like a mirror, this vision of his. It is this mirror held, this attempt to convey one's vision to others, that constitutes literature.

Sanskrit Literature is no exception to these general observations. From the early days when hymns were chanted by the Vedic seers to the rising sun in the east, to the shining fire on the altar, to the thundering clouds above, we find in literary compositions contemporary life and thoughts. Some of the Vedic hymns, especially those sung in honour of the Dawn or of Indra, the wielder of the Thunderbolt, are fine specimens of fact and fancy. The Vedic hymns are the earliest known (Sanskrit) Literature. Therein do observation, sympathy and surprise play the most important part. It would be a

of the human mind. The human mind in its freshness is so interested in life and sets to study it; then it is so interested in the study itself that it makes life un-interesting. Specialisation has neither place in nor favour with human life. Human life is ever fresh. Specialisation is ever stale. It is for this reason that small connection indeed is found between scientific study and life, between technical literature and the tedium of life. It should not be supposed that technical study is entirely irrelevant in life. From our present point of view, however, technical study has no place in literature. The Sūtra literature of the 6th century B.C. along with the earlier tendencies it represents, has nothing to convey of the life of the average man and has also no interest for the average man.

Side by side with the Sūtras is to be found another form of literature which, in contrast to the technical, could be termed popular. The material available in this respect too is meagre: nevertheless the little that is known is genuinely illustrative and hence sufficient for the present purpose. The earliest that could be called popular without any hesitation is the epic literature viz. the two epics—the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa. These two works are essentially narrative stories. The authors themselves reveal their intention of setting the narrative to recitation. Thus, the Mbh:—

idam śata-sahasram tu
ślokānām puṇya-karmaṇām
upākhyānaiḥ saha jñeyam
śrāvyam bhāratam uttamam (I-i-77)

“Here are 100,000 verses describing meritorious (i.e. heroic) deeds; together with the legends therein, this work—the Bhārata—is the best to be listened to.”

That these works were mainly intended for the populace is evident from many obvious circumstances. The benefits to the listeners as enumerated are too tempting. The contents too are tempting. Besides the material relevant to the story, could be found all that would appeal to the average mind and intellect. The commonplace of life is not excluded.³ The style is simple and direct—direct in the sense of being less literary or artificial and more free or colloquial.

3. Cf. vākya-jāti-viśeṣāś ca loka-yātrā-kramāś ca yaḥ “(Herein is to be found the interesting observation as well as the ways of the world)” Mbh. I-i-94.

That the epics form a landmark in the growth of Sanskrit Literature is but obvious. The amount of work done by scholars in this respect is eloquent enough. The point relevant here is different. We are concerned not with what the epics achieved but with what they encouraged. With no amount of exaggeration it might be said that the Mahābhārata first and the Rāmāyaṇa next introduced a new vogue into Sanskrit Literature. What we now speak of as Literary Art in general could be said to have begun in India with the writing of the epics. What is interesting now and must have been no less than a miracle in those days is turning literature into an art. What with the Vedic sentiments growing dim, what with the mysteries invested and ascribed thereto by the Brāhmaṇas, what with the esoteric speculations of the Upaniṣads and what with the stifling style of the Sūtras, men must have welcomed, applauded, encouraged and been enraptured by literature like the epics which would flow in easy narration, would ebb with emotions and charm with music! The epics are such, describing the heroic deeds, the thrilling adventures and the noble efforts of warrior-princes. What would be more pleasing and more comfortable to a people living in mystic horror of powerful surroundings than Man depicted as a successful hero against all evil and inconvenient forces? More pleasing still as the manner in which it was done, viz., by means of pithy, intelligible verses known as Ślokas.

That literature could be so stimulating and refreshing and fascinating was a new experience which was felt in all the first flush of enthusiasm. The post-epic works that have been retained for us through tradition are mostly works where literature is an art; wherein the purpose is more to enthrall and to enrapture than to teach or to speculate. We shall find along this tradition some masters of letters who have successfully emulated the authors of the epics in blending Art with Life, Pleasure with Intelligence, Beauty with Morality, and Ecstasy with Divinity. Thinkers have thought, teachers have taught, and poets have sung not in the school-books of logic or rhyme but in artistic forms modelled on the epic. The one notable feature of the preserved post-epic literature is life through enjoyment and appreciation of Beauty or Harmony or whatever one would like to call the convenient and comfortable adjustment of man to his surroundings.

It should not be supposed that all this is a phantom raised by our own enthusiasm. Appreciation was quite early admitted as

a necessary faculty in study and culture. This statement could be well illustrated by a reference to Bharata's Nāṭya-Śāstra. It matters little indeed to us whether Bharata is really the author, whether the Nāṭya-Śāstra belongs to the post-Christian or the pre-Christian era. We are concerned not with the thoughts of Bharata (or of the Nāṭya-Śāstra) but with the tendencies he (or it) represents. Bharata's treatment of this question presupposes that the subject has been under discussion a long time before; secondly, Bharata quotes the opinions of his predecessors. For this reason we feel justified in accepting the validity of Bharata's remarks with reference to the post-epic literary phenomena. Charm and appreciation, says Bharata, form the key-note of a literary piece. Nothing exists or excels without *rasa* (na hi rasādṛte kaś cid arthaḥ pravartate, p. 71). That *rasa* includes among others the idea of charm and appreciation foremost is apparent from the analysis (N. S. chap. VI), that follows the above statement.

(i) In the first place, *rasa* is explained in general terms as follows :—

rasa iti kaḥ padārthaḥ ? atra ucyate ;
 āśvādyatvāt. Katham āśvādyo rasaḥ ? atra ucyate ;
 Yathā hi nānā-vyañjana-saṃskṛtam annam bhuñjānā
 rasān, āśvādayanti sumanasah puruṣāḥ harṣādīnś
 cāpi adhigacchanti tathā nānābhāva-abhinaya-
 vyañjitān vāg-aṅgasattvopetān sthāyi-bhāvān
 āśvādayanti sumanasah prekṣakāḥ.

"I shall tell you what *rasa* is and how it is enjoyed (i.e. experienced). In a meal consisting of various tastes and savours the diners are pleased with one feeling of pleasure arising from different causes. Likewise the audience would feel rapture through experience conveyed by emotions and movements."

(ii) Secondly the details of *rasa* experience are analysed as follows :—

A percept or a feeling depends on a stimulus. The stimulus is known as the vibhāva. Response to a stimulus is two-fold, voluntary and involuntary; the involuntary or the immediate is physical or perceptible and is known as the anubhāva; the voluntary or the mental is a reaction and is known as the vyabhicāribhāva. The involuntary or the anubhāva has a physical cause (i.e. is due to

a direct contact) and a mental effect as in the case of perspiring through fear or of being thrilled by pleasant suddenness etc.; the voluntary or the *vyabhicāribhāva* has a mental cause and physical effect as in the case of being tired or of feeling relaxed etc. A stimulus with this two-fold response means a complete experience or appreciation. To feel the bodily thrill and to be exhilarated at heart is the complete experience of beautiful in Nature; unless we do that we do not feel at home (to speak in prose fashion) or we do not lose ourselves (to speak the same poetically) in the beauty surrounding us. This state of losing oneself is known to Bharata as the *sthāyi-bhāva* (i.e. a state of unperturbed peace) and he says that the *vibhāva*, the *anubhāva* and the *vyabhicāribhāva* merge into harmony or the *sthāyi-bhāva*. In other words when Bharata says that *rasa* is the *sine qua non* of a literary work he only means that the work would serve as a stimulus by experiencing which the reader or the spectator is appreciatingly charmed into a complete surrender. This view of Bharata was taken up later on by the rhetorician Ānandavardhana who maintains that a *Kāvya* or literary piece could be appreciated only by a *sahṛdaya*; the word "sahṛdaya" he explains as follows:—

yeṣāṃ kāvya-abhyāsa-anuśīlana-vaśād
viśadībhūte mano-mukure varṇanīyatanmayībhavana-
yogyatā te hṛdayasamvādabhājah saṛdayāḥ.

A *sahṛdaya* is thus one whose mind and tastes are refined and who is sympathetic to the extent of losing himself in (i.e. identifying with) the things experienced.

We are anticipating, however. All this discussion only shows that a time was when literary works were solely judged with reference to charm and appreciation. And such a time, it is urged here, began with the epics.

The epics were important from another point of view too. They formed a charming recitation; and recitation would be still more easy, convenient and charming if it were undertaken by those who were either gifted or trained for it. The popularity of the epics opened a great chance for such a class of reciters. In the epics themselves we have evidence to show that the work of training reciters came into existence soon after, if not simultaneously. The chief narrator in the present version of the *Mbh.* is Sauti, the son or descendant of Sūta. The epic *Rāmāyana* was sung by Kuśilavas

trained by the author—the sage Vālmīki—himself. Sūta, however, seems to be the earliest of a trained class of reciters. The Sūta was probably a professional. In the Mbh., at the opening of the Āstika Parvan, Sauti, says :—

itihāsam imam viprāḥ purāṇam paricakṣate
kṛṣṇa-dvaipāyana-proktam naimiṣāranyavāsiṣu
pūrvam pracoditaḥ Sūtaḥ pitā me Lomaharṣaṇaḥ
tasmād aham upaśrūtya pravakṣyāmi yathātatham.

(“This legend is supposed to be very old ; it was narrated by Vyāsa to the residents of the Naimiṣa forest ; my father Lomaharṣaṇa was first trained to recite it, and I shall narrate it just as I have learnt it from my father” (I-xiii-6-8).)

This Sūta, however, should be distinguished from the Māgadha, a bard, who was also a reciter.* Though both were professional reciters the Māgadha was a kind of “a Court bard” who recited mainly, if not only, the genealogy and the greatness of the king under whom he served. The Sūta was a *paurāṇika* i.e. one who knew the whole traditional lore and was also a wandering minstrel. The style of the epics encouraged the growth and importance of the Sūta class ; and that class in its turn perpetuated the popularity of the epics.

Lastly, the epics fulfilled another function. By their fervour and popularity they not only directed but also restricted positively the course of subsequent literature to one, uniform channel. Most of the extant later Sanskrit works are modelled on the epics. It was only an accident that the bulk of the Mbh. prevented it from being a source of emulation while the Rāmāyaṇa, written as it was round one hero and with no complications or digressions, formed the chief model ; but if the Rāmāyaṇa was the source of emulation the Mahābhārata was as often the source of inspiration. In all this the later writers unfortunately miscalculated. At the time they wrote, the Sanskrit of the epics was further and further being removed from the contemporary form it had assumed in the meanwhile. A direct appeal to the reader was now out of question. So we find in all these later works—known as the classical Sanskrit Literature—a lack of the natural ease and charm and flow of the epics ; secondly, a deliberate attempt to make up for that loss by artificial means like extravagance and ostentation.

4. Cf. in this connexion C.H.I. Vol. I, p. 130, 131, 257 & 297.

In spite of this incidental divergence, Classical Sanskrit Literature remained as near the epic models as possible. As time went on the Sūta class disappeared and in its place are to be found the court poets combining in themselves the rôles of both the Sūta and the Māgadha. The story of the Sūta and the style of the Māgadha are now to be found together. It is not intended here to convey that the whole of the Classical Sanskrit Literature is the work of Court-poets. The petty princelings that came into existence after the disruption of the Mauryan Empire (2nd century B.C.) had pleasure and satisfaction in listening to the unheard of and impracticable glories ascribed to themselves by a poet who would further attempt to trace the origin of his patron back to any of the epic heroes. Rivalry was one of the causes of the spread of such a class of literature. An accident of earlier vanity was accepted as a tradition in the later days till, in spite of the fact that Sanskrit was unpopular, i.e. unintelligible to the average reader, Sanskrit works were written in the epic style even as late as the 11th century A.D. ! (leave alone the later pedants). Indulgently nourished like a child of rich parents and denied the fresh air and the vigorous exercise in popular appreciation this class of Sanskrit Literature died an inevitable death. It died so miserable and wretched that no sane attempt has ever since been made to revive it.

CHAPTER II

FORM OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE

In the last chapter, we made a rapid survey of Sanskrit Literature in its broad relations to the tendencies of contemporary life. A natural expression of Life in the early Vedic days, Sanskrit literature plumed itself into an art, an expression of joy and beauty, and then, for various reasons, art decayed into artificiality, and died at last the inevitable death of an uncongenial, unnatural element.

To simplify the historical sketch no mention was made there of another factor ; that is, the form of the Sanskrit Literature. By 'form' is meant the material aspect or what would be roughly distinguished as prose and poetry. The earliest Vedic hymns had a material form, divided into verses of two to four lines of an equal number of syllables. The language of the Vedic hymns was peculiar in one respect ; it had a tone accent. This accent had a grammatical value inasmuch as it determined the position and the relation of the word in the sentence, and sometimes even the meaning of the word and so on. As a result, superficially, the chanting of the Vedic hymns had a musical effect.

After the four Vedas the accents with their original significance are missed. Further, the form of the Brahmanic and the Upaniṣadic Literature differs on the whole from that of the hymns. It is *not metrical*. Probably, the discursive nature of their contents compelled the authors of the Brāhmaṇas and of the majority of the Upaniṣads to write in a prose style, while the descriptive nature of the Vedic hymns gave freer scope for metrical composition. The literature of the Black Yajurveda is the only earlier literature written in a prose style.¹ We have, as already mentioned, Yāska's Nirukta—a scientific work on Etymology—written in a prose style. The question of prose or poetry may not, after all, have been related to the discursive or the descriptive nature of the work concerned. That the question is, however, important for the present purpose will be seen presently.

Writing was not known before the 8th century B C.² Even

1. C. H. I. Vol. I, p. 114.

2. Oxford History of India, pp. 27 and 136.

after it was introduced the difficulties involved, for want of other materials, were enough to dissuade even an enthusiast. So literature in those days must naturally have passed on orally. Even this oral "publication" entailed much labour and more difficulties. Common experience shows that poetry, with its fixed length and its equal number of syllables and its rhyme, is easier to be memorised than prose, which is more fluid. For this reason, the poetic i.e. the metrical style must have found more favour in those days. The only attempt to simplify the study of prose works was made in the Sūtras but its very success scared the average reader away.

Here again the authors of the epics showed a shrewd foresight. With the boldness of a genius they faced the realities and with the skill of an artist they gave them a form. The epic story in itself would have appealed to the readers but by utilising the metrical form for narration that appeal was made stronger and more lasting. Even the metre used was the simplest viz the anuṣṭubh or the śloka with four feet of eight syllables.³ The task was made easy both for the reciter and his audience. Thus, in the Mbh. the reciter Vaiśampāyana says :—

- (i) Śrāvyānām uttam cedam. "Most pleasing to listen to" (I-lxii-18).
- (ii) Śrāvyam Śruti-sukham caiva. "To be recited and also listened to with pleasure." (ibid. 52).
- (iii) Vistūyaitat mahad jñānam ṛṣiḥ samkṣīpya cābravīt | iṣṭam hi viduṣām loke samāsa-vyūsa-dhāraṇam, "This great lore has been narrated by the sage in brevity and at length ; what is more convenient to learners than to get knowledge in these two ways ?"
- (iv) Alakṣyaṁ śubhaiḥ śabdaiḥ samayair divya-mānuṣaiḥ | chandovṛttaiḥ ca vividhaiḥ anvitam viduṣām priyam "Words are charming, situations both human and superhuman, rhymes and metres vary ; so it (i.e. the epic) will charm the learned."

A thrilling narration, a simple metre, and musical variations. What wonder then that the epics should form the ideal of all future writers? Of the two, the Rāmāyaṇa had the further advantage of being short

3 For a fuller discussion vide G. E. I. Chap IV.

and compact, more systematic and more poetic; for this reason, the Rāmāyaṇa was hailed as the ādi-kāvya or the first literary poem.

As a result of such circumstances poetic style became the vehicle of popular literature. In the early days of the epics it was only convenient to recite and easier to follow. But as time wore down the language of the epics to variations and modifications the advantage of the style diminished; and as writing came more and more into vogue the early advantage of a recitational style lost its force. But in spite of such changes in the language within and in the society without the post-epic poets copied the metrical model of the epics. Longer and more difficult metres were introduced. Narration too lost its simplicity and naturalness, and the poetic style that was once the magician's wand of a popular artist turned into the school-master's rod of a pedant. The music that touched the finer chords of human hearts turned to a drone that sent to sleep some self-centred petty prince or that pampered the pundits into drowsy applause.

It would be bold indeed on our part to insist that the post-epic Sanskrit Literature, blindly following the models, crashed headlong into decadence. Literature, after all, is the production of the poet and the artist. If literature is degraded it only means that it is in the hands of mere pretenders to literary laurels. The form of the epics was retained more because of what it had achieved in its own days than of what it was or would be achieving subsequently. That form had outlived its fresh appeal and its faithful art. The prose attempts of the earlier days culminated in the sūtras developing a technology; thus they lost contemporary popular sympathy and ceased to represent popular life. Likewise, soon enough, the epic style too developed into a science with a technology⁴; and thus restricted it too lost the general sympathy and ceased to represent contemporary social activities and ambitions. Nothing could illustrate this remark better than a casual observation of the monotonous,

4. By the 8th century A.D. we come across works, supposedly on Rhetorics or literary criticism. It is a pitiful sight of intelligent writers and thinkers wasting themselves on the details of what a hero must be like in a Kāvya, how the Kāvya should begin and how it should end, what things are to be described therein and in what sequence and such superficial points *ad nauseum*. Though these works do not appear till the 8th century the views therein were probably being formed a long time before.

the rule-bound form* of the Kāvya that repeated itself through different ages and with different poets. We might take any Kāvya—say the Buddhacarita of Aśvaghōṣa, one of the earliest of the Classical period and compare it with any one of the latest—say the Jānakīharana of Kumārādāsa of Ceylon; we will find that essentially there is no difference in the form and the treatment—an identical beginning, the same arrangement of (oftentimes the same) ideas, facts and fancies and figures of the same tone and touch and so on! There is nothing like a development; on the other hand, there is a desperate attempt, naturally doomed to failure, to preserve the epic model.

It is relieving, however, to find that imitation is not the only contribution of the post-epic period. Every generation has its own ideas and its own ways of expression. The ideas may be based on or borrowed from those of the previous generation, still they appear new either because the generation is new or because the mode of expression is different. The Vedic seers composed their hymns; their descendants expressed same or similar ideas but in a different style (i.e. a different point of view); in the epic days the same ideas were arranged in a peculiar form and expressed in a fresh style; and similarly, the post-epic period introduced, beside the epic, a literary style of their own where the old, old materials were arranged in a new fashion. It should be further noted that almost all the Great Sanskrit writers after the epic have subscribed to this new form, testifying at once to the greatness of their own powers and the freshness of the latest style. That style is the form found in Sanskrit dramas.

Superficially speaking, the form of Sanskrit dramas is not quite new or original. Instead of the purely prose or the purely poetic style of earlier works, these dramas were written partly in prose and partly in verse. Secondly, the purpose of the epic viz., to turn literature into art—a path of roses to charm and appreciation of joy and Beauty—this purpose, was carried into the dramas. What is the artistic purpose or effect of a drama? Bharata, in his Nāṭya-Śāstra, gives a frank reply to this question.

duḥkḥartānām śramārtānām śokārtānām tapasvinām
viśrāma-jananam loke nāṭyam etad bhaviṣyati;
vinoda-jananam kāle nāṭyam etad bhaviṣyati;

“Drama shall be a comfort, an amusement and a refreshment to all

those that are grieved, miserable or weary" (4-111 b, 112 a, 117 a). So does Kālidāsa, himself a great dramatist, answer this question.

nāṭyam bhinna-rucer janasya bahudhā'pyekam samārāadhanam
 "Drama, thought of various types, is an entertainment common to people of different tastes." (Mal. I. 4).

Bhavabhūti, another great playwright of later days, is still more explicit on this point :

bhūmnā rasānām gahanāḥ prayogāḥ
 sauhārda-hṛdyāni viceṣṭitāni
 audhhatyam āyojita-kāmasūtram
 citrāḥ kathā vāci vidagdhatā ca.

"Sentiments are depicted in all their subtlety ; the actions are charming and reasonable ; there is sense and dignity ; the plot is unusual and the dialogue skilful. (Such plays alone are considered good. MM. I-6)" The protestations of Bhavabhūti are echoed by a later writer on dramaturgy viz., Dhanañjaya the author of Daśarūpaka. Drama, to him, is no class-room moral lesson :

ānanda-niṣyandiṣu rūpakeṣu
 vyutpatti-mātram phalam alpabuddhiḥ
 yo'pitiḥāsādivad āha sādhuḥ
 tasmai namaḥ svāduparānmukhāya

"Dramatic representations are the pure expressions of Joy ; the innocent fool who believes that Drama, like the study of Itihāsa and others, improves only the intellectual outlook, has no sense of Beauty or Enjoyment." (D. R. I. 6). Instances might be multiplied to show that enjoyment i.e. charm and appreciation formed the foremost feature of dramas. The idea of charm and appreciation, as explained above, was first put into practice by the authors of the epics.

Sanskrit dramas copied the epics in another respect. The outstanding features of the epic style were narration and description. The stories of the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa are more human in outlook and treatment compared with the mythology of the Vedic hymns or with the Upaniṣadic discussions. This introduction of life-like incidents and emotions was retained in the dramas in only as far as borrowing their plots from or modelling them upon those in the epics. More will be said on this feature in another place. Here

it is mentioned as a sufficient reason to show how classical Sanskrit dramas are indebted to the epics. The indebtedness is so close that when after a time, the Nāṭya-śāstra is written, the author boasts therein of drama in the same tones in which the Mbh. boasts of itself Bharata says :—

na taj jñānam na tacchilpam na sā vidyā na sā kalā
na sā yogo na tat karma nāṭye'smin yan na drśyate ;
sarvaśāstrāṇi śilpāṇi karmāṇi vividhāṇi ca ;
veda-vidyatihāsānām ākhyānaparikalpanam ;

“There is no knowledge, no fine art, no learning, no skill, no yoga and no activity that is not represented in Drama. (Here are) all the śāstras, all the fine arts and actions of diverse nature... .In Drama are narrated and represented all the Vedic and all the traditional or legendary lore” (I. 114, 112b ; 116b).⁵ Just as Vyāsa wrote the Mbh and trained his disciples to recite it, so did Bharata :

ākhyāpito viditvā'ham nāṭyavedam pitāmahāt
putrān adhyāpayam yogyān prayogam cāśya tattvatah

“I learnt this Veda of Dramaturgy from God Brahman and then I taught my sons (or disciples) both its theory and its practice” (I. 25)

Thus we see that most of the original features of the epic style are borrowed by the Drama literature. That the Drama should also borrow the tendency to claim a hoary tradition and a perfection in the same tones as the epic is eloquent enough. But that is only half the truth ; the other half is more important, more enlightening and also more refreshing—as it reveals some new features into literature for the first time. Though they form the subject of a detailed study later, just one or two of them would be considered here.

The most important and the original feature is the introduction of the Prākṛts. Those who have a historical knowledge of the linguistic development of Sanskrit might question the originality of this feature. Most of the Prākṛts were, at one time—probably *after the epics*, spoken dialects. To write in a style nearer the spoken one was first attempted by the epics. So why should not one say

5 cf the famous line in the Mbh

yad ihāsti tad anyatra yan nehāsti na tat kvacit

“What is here is elsewhere, what is not here cannot be found elsewhere”

that even the introduction of the Prākṛts was just a tendency borrowed from the epics? Why not indeed? But the difficulty lies in taking the Prākṛt passages of the available plays as genuine specimens of actually spoken dialects. Originality in this respect concerns more with the boldness of placing these dialects side by side with the sacred tongue. The two Śanskrit authorities on Dramaturgy have recognised the importance of this innovation. Thus Bharata :—

nāṭya-yoge tu kartavyam kāvyam bhāṣāsamāśrayam.

“In a play staged the composition should be based on the *local dialects*.” (XVIII-43).

The Daśarūpaka, too, is equally insistent. (11-63)
 deśa bhāṣā-kriyā-veśā-lakṣaṇāḥ syuḥ pravṛttayaḥ
 lokād evādhigamyatāḥ yathaucityam prayojayet

“In all the productions dress, actions and speech should be taken directly from the Society and should be properly observed.”

It would not be unreasonable, therefore, to believe that the introduction of the Prākṛts was an innovation of the post-epic period.

Another important feature of the Drama literature—a feature which is new and original—is the “humanising” tendency. Though the epics had made literature a source of pleasure and interest to the average readers, their success was due more to the style than to the treatment. The story itself was still fantastic; the characters therein were super-human heroes, semi-divine beings, or demons of evil and darkness. This element of “super-naturalism” of the heroic age was retained by the later Kāvya works and to appreciable extent even by the Drama literature. But side by side developed a tendency of turning literature from a mere luxury to a light on life. The ordinary beings with the fun and pain, the ideas and idiosyncracies, the humours and habits of routine life were utilised by the dramatic artists. Literature was here “democratised”—so to say. No evidence would be more convincing than the mention of the fact that prakaraṇa—such was the name of one of the earliest forms in Dramatic literature. Let Bharata himself explain what a prakaraṇa is (N. S. XX):—

yatra kavirātma-buddhyā vastu śarīram ca nāṭakam caiva
 autpattikam prakurute prakaraṇam etad budhair jñeyam (49).
 vipra-vaṇik-sacivānām purohitāmātya-sārhavāhānām
 caritam yad anekavidham tad jñeyam prakaraṇam nāma. (52)

nodāttanāyakakṛtam na divyacaritam na rājasambhogam
 bāhya-jana-samprayuktam vijñeyam prakaraṇam tajñaiḥ. (53).
 saciva-śreṣṭh-brāhmaṇa-purohitāmātya-sārthavāhānām
 gṛhavārtā yatra bhavet. (55)

“Let the wise people know that a prakaraṇa is an original production of a poet dealing with the varied life-story of Brahmins, tradesmen, ambassadors, purohīts, ministers, merchants, etc. No kings, no super-human incidents, no heroes of an exalted type to be found here. Let the wise know that a prakaraṇa deals with the routine (domestic aspects of an ordinary (bāhyajana) human being.” Daśarūpaka, more or less, repeats these ideas (D. R. III 39), and Viśvanātha, too, in his Sāhitya Darpaṇa summarises the same views (S. D. VI 224). All this is sufficient to show that prakaraṇa was a piece built up by the author's imagination but based on or related to the incidents in the life of an average man; no extraordinary situations, no super-human deeds, no exalted powers. Some Sanskrit prakaraṇas like Śūdraka's Mṛcchakaṭīka or Bhavabhūti's Mālati-Mādhava may not be all we desire when a play is based on actual social life. What is important is the tendency to bring literature nearer and nearer to everyday life.

We are now in a position to summarise the main tendencies of literary development in Sanskrit. In the Vedic days hymns were sung in honour of baffling super-human elements. The feeling behind and the fervour in these hymns were shared by that primitive society as a whole. The rich fancy of the hymns fascinated many a generation following, with the result that that fancy was studied at one time and emulated at another. But that feeling and that fervour were now neither fresh nor popular; so the study in the Brāhmaṇas and the emulation of the Upaniṣads assumed aristocratic airs and, like any aristocracy, were out of touch with popular life. The Aryans as a people were still pushing far and wide over India, their life was still adventurous. That adventurous life was represented in the epics, a glorious life set to enchanting music. The result was so successful that the epics served as literary models for a long time to come, extending even to the times when the very life of the epic days loomed past and fantastic. The last stage of our survey covers a field where the epic style was not merely modelled upon but modified to an advantage. That is the field of Dramatic literature.

So far the survey reads like one story. But so many objections can be legitimately directed against it. Can the literary development be traced along the lines suggested above? Can it be shown that the Drama literature comes after the epics and *not at all* before? Were there no dramas before the epics? Questions like these will have to be answered throughout the present work. The question that would face us first is that of the origin of Sanskrit Drama. An answer to that question would meet many of the above and similar objections. So to that question of the origin of Sanskrit Drama we shall now turn.)

not at all helpful. Why should not Brahma create a fifth Veda that would be accessible to all, irrespective of their caste-distinctions? (Sārva-varṇikam)². Brahmā consented. He made an easy and skilful job of it. With the existing four Vedas as his materials he created the Nāṭya—wherein the text was taken from the R̥gveda, the music from the Sāmaveda, the action from the Yajurveda and the rasa from the Atharvan.³ It was a silent revolution and was acceptable to both the old and the new worlds. This piece, called itihāsa, Indra was asked to produce. Indra, however, pleaded his inability. "Sire, the Gods are not able to understand, execute and express this lore; the Gods are not at all suited for Drama."⁴ Thereupon the sage Bharata was entrusted with that task. Bharata soon showed that he deserved this divine compliment. Bharata was a man with a shrewd insight and a practical sense. He had the further advantage of being the father of hundred sons⁵ whom he could "coach up" with all paternal rigour. But soon he found out that he had to include some ladies as certain parts were impossible to be played by men.⁶ The wise sage did not flinch. On his request Brahmā supplied Apsaras damsels.⁷ Then the heavenly musicians, like Nārada and others were assembled. The play to be produced was "The Defeat of the Demons." Naturally, the demons took strong objection to it and were wroth that Brahmā should license such a performance likely to disturb the peace of the citizens. The "open fields" (dhvajamaha)⁸ of Indra made it easy for the opponents to attack and prevent the production. In the interests of safety, it was found that a play-house well protected by walls on all sides was essential.⁹ Later on, the demons were pacified by Brahmā who explained to them the nature as well as the purpose and functions of Drama. Here are the eloquent words in which Brahmā pleaded the greatness of Drama.

"Why are you so displeased, my demon friends? I have created this Nāṭyaveda so that there would be a better mutual under-

2. N. S. I-17.

3. *Ibid.* I-17.

4. *Ibid.* I-22.

5. *Ibid.* I-24-41.

6. *Ibid.* I-46.

7. *Ibid.*, I. 48-50.

8. *Ibid.* I. 55.

9. *Ibid.* I. 79-80.

standing (karmabhāvanvayāpekṣo) between you and the Gods. It is not a piece of propaganda of any one section. The three worlds shall be described here. There is religion for those who are religious minded, love for those that are amorous minded, knowledge for the ignorant, criticism of the learned, a delight to the Gods and a solace to the afflicted. In short, every one will find in Drama just what he needs and what is good for him. It preaches yet delights, it recreates yet it is reasonable, it teaches and yet is broad-minded. Where else could you find reason with recreation, knowledge with attraction, and morality with beauty?"¹⁰ The demons must have been men with hearts. They were not only pacified but entirely satisfied

Chapter II of the N. S. can be passed over in this connection as it merely describes the erection and the details of the nāṭyaveśma—or the play-house¹¹. In the new play-house Bharata went through all the preliminary ceremonies (III). By this time the sage had grown wiser by experience and did not revive "the Defeat of the Demons." (With his band of actors he waited on Brahmā to receive orders as to which play was to be staged. It was decided to play the "samavakāra" performance named "The Nectar Churning" (amṛta-manthana).¹² Brahmā was so pleased that he volunteered to introduce the company to God Śiva, and in the presence of the latter a "dīma" performance, by name "the Burning of the Three Forts" (tripura-dāha), was given. (God Śiva too commended the actors whom he found promising and, to make the performance better, he undertook the task of personally supervising and introducing dance and music into the show.¹³)

Thus does Bharata describe, at length and in rapture, the first dramatic production under his management. This account has mystified many scholars, and many more were justified under the circumstances to dismiss the whole narration as of no historical value. One is rather surprised to find that these scholars should insist that history ought to have been written, in those earlier days, in the same style as in the modern days. With a little more patience and a more accurate analysis it will be seen that Bharata is not as fantastic as

10. *Ibid.* I. 102-118.

11. For a fuller interpretation of these Chapters see Chapter XX of this work.

12. N. S. IV 1-4.

13. *Ibid.* IV. 10-15.

(he appears to be. Let us only remember that the two first performances are known as "samavakāra" and "dīma."

The *samavakāra* is defined¹⁴ as follows :—

devāsura-bīja kṛtaṃ prakhyāto-dāta-nāyakam caiva

"A representation wherein the hero is well known and highly placed, where the story develops on the fight between the Gods and the demons."

What is important from our point of view is the fact that the story represents a fight. How was this fight represented on the stage? The answer to this question is given by Bharata himself in another connexion¹⁵. Brahmā, the sponsor of Drama was watching a fight between God Kṛṣṇa and two demons, Madhu and Kaiṭabha. This fight was fought out by Kṛṣṇa successfully but, strange to say, the success owed itself to Brahmā's directions. The various postures and methods into which the fight developed appealed to Brahmā from an artistic point of view. He was so pleased with the whole show that he immediately set to introduce those postures and methods into his pet fancy viz., the nāṭya or drama. Ultimately he did so in the form of the four vṛttis or styles. What are these vṛttis? Are they the different methods of representation or are they merely methods under different circumstances? An analysis of the description of these four vṛttis might help us to answer this question.

(i) First is the Bhārati vṛtti taken from the Rgveda¹⁶. It is defined as :—

yā vāk-pradhānā puruṣa-prayojyā
strī-varjitā saṃskṛta-vākya-yuktā
svanāmadheyair bhārataih prayuktā
sā bhārati nāma bhavet tu vṛttiḥ¹⁷

"It consists of mere speeches or recitation and is only played by men. There are to be no ladies at all. The language here is Sanskrit and the actors represent it under their own names." Here there is no representation, so to say. There are no "made-up" rôles as the (supposed) actors are to speak and act under their own

14. *Ibid.* XX. 66.

15. *Ibid.* XXII. 1-22.

16. *Ibid.* XXII. 24.

17. *Ibid.* XXII. 25.

names. It is merely recitational, since it is taken from the R̥g-Vedic hymns. And there was no place for ladies at all.

(ii) Next comes the Sātvatī vṛtti.

vāgaṅgābhīnayavatī sattvotthāna-vacana-prakaraneṣu
sattvādhikārayuktā vijñeyā sātvaṭī vṛttiḥ.¹⁸

"Whenever there is an emotional context, it is accompanied by speech, and acting; if, in addition, there is an abundance of "sattva" it is the Sātvatī vṛtti." What "Sattva" is, is explained by Bharata in another place.¹⁹ It is defined as :

*avyakta-rūpam sattvam hi jñeyam bhāvarasāśrayām
yathāsthāna-rasopetam romāñcāsṛādibhir guṇaiḥ.

"It is something subtle and clever on which depends the proper representation of sentiments and feelings" i.e. where there is "acting" as we know it. This vṛtti is apparently taken from the Yajurveda. Here there is recitation as well as acting. As the author speaks of rasa, it is probable that the actors were expected to reveal the supposed effects of the actions by tears etc.

(iii) The third vṛtti is the Kaiśikī.

yā ślakṣṇa-nepathya-viśeṣa-citrā
strī-samyutā yā bahu-nṛtta-gītā
kāmapabhoga-prabhavopacārī
tām kaiśikīm vṛttim udāharanti.²⁰

"There are females in the representation, plenty of music and dance, representation of love-affairs, and lastly there is beautiful 'dressing-up' (Ślakṣṇa-nepathya-viśeṣa-citrā)." Three points in this definition deserve to be noticed; (a) presence of actress, (b) dance and music, and (c) impersonation. The first two are closely related to each other; nay, it appears each is essential for the other. For, in the very first chapter, Bharata says :—

kaiśikī ślakṣṇa-nepathya śṛṅgāra-rasa-sambhavā
aśakyā puruṣaiḥ sādhu prayoktum strījanād ṛte.²¹

18. *Ibid* XXII. 39.

19. *Ibid*. XXIV 3

20. *Ibid*. XXII 47.

21. *Ibid* , XXII 57

"The Kaiśikī dealing with Love and requiring beautiful dressing is impossible to be staged by men, without women." I-46.

(iv) The last vṛtti is the Ārabhaṭī.

prastāva-pāta-pluta-lāghitāni
cānyāni māyākṛtam indrajālam
citrāṇi yuktāni ca yatra nityam
tam tādṛśīm ārabhaṭīm vadanti.

"Where there are various kinds of music, flight, dance, magic etc. represented regularly." It should be noted that herein we find some permanent setting (yatra nityam) i.e. some sort of stage equipment which would help an honest representation of the various actions.

Without going into further details the four vṛttis might be summarised as under :—

- (i) Bhāratī or purely recitational.
- (ii) Sātvatī or recitation and acting.
- (iii) Kaiśikī or impersonation with music and dance, and
- (iv) Ārabhaṭī or a true-to-life representation on an equipped stage.

If we remember that during Kṛṣṇa's fight with the demons Brahmā observed the four vṛttis in the same order as mentioned so far and introduced them likewise in the nāṭya, would we not be justified in believing that the four vṛttis are not merely four varieties of representation but a progressive chain in four stages? Does not the opening account of Bharata, as described above, bear out this belief? The first performance was a Samavakāra, named "The Nectar-churning." It must have been a pure recitation, a description with probably no device to represent the action.

Ḍima.

The second performance was a *ḍima* which has been defined as one where the story and the hero are well known.

māyendra-jāla-bahulo bahu-puruṣoṭthāna-bhedaśamyuktaḥ.
devūsura-rākṣasa-bhūta-yakṣa-nāgās ca puruṣāḥ syuḥ.²²

"Where there is a great number of male characters and a good deal of make-believe" etc. The "make-believe" is probably the *vāgan-gābhinaya* i.e. the bodily movements of the Sātvati vṛtti. Without repeating, one thing has to be naturally insisted upon here. The information of the Nāṭyaśāstra may not contain facts, but there is no harm (why, there is more reason) in believing that the work, at the worst, attempts to preserve a tradition. In doing this, it describes the different trends in the development of Drama as a representation. Its vocabulary and its technique of description are peculiar to the age. The treatise might be one fairly late. But would that fact alone be a sufficient argument to show that even the tendencies and the tradition preserved therein belong to the latest age?

There is another reason in not disbelieving the above account so hastily. A critical arrangement and a reasonable interpretation of the facts would reveal some interesting points. To those we shall now turn. To render the discussion more intelligible, we shall first mention the three points that emerge from the traditional account.

(i) The credit for the first production of a dramatic representation belongs to one Bharata ;

(ii) A consistent attempt has been made throughout to establish a connexion between the nāṭya and the four Vedas ; and

(iii) with reference to the Bhārati vṛtti, a probable evolution from dumb show to a dramatic representation has been hinted at.

We shall now consider these points one by one.)

CHAPTER IV

WHO IS BHARATA ?

Bharata, tradition tells us, is the originator of Drama. He is the Prometheus of the Drama world. Like so many other men of genius of the primitive days, Bharata is placed behind a mist-like halo. The difficulty is not so much in finding out when and where Bharata lived as in acknowledging that he was a real, living person. Bharata is a name well known to the Hindu tradition. In the Vedic days, Bharata was a name of one of the Vedic tribes. Secondly, "Bharata" was supposed to be the name of a king (son of Śakuntalā and Duśyanta) who became the first Emperor (Sārvabhauma). Thirdly, "Bharata" is the name of a sage, the traditional author of the Nāṭyaśāstra (not to be confused with the originator of Dramatic Representation). And lastly in the N. S. itself the word "bharata" is used in the sense of "an actor."

Under these circumstances it is not easy to determine who the Bharata, mentioned in connection with the Nāṭyaśāstra, is. The first two meanings viz., that of "a tribe" and that of "the name of a king" have been entirely ruled out by scholars: as regards the others, scholars have not been able to determine (i) whether Bharata was a mystical sage postulated by the actors themselves, who were called "bharata" and/or (ii) whether Bharata was a real person in honour of whose initiative enterprise the actors were called "bharata"s.¹

That the insistence of scholars is not so well placed will be noticed on a closer examination of the facts. Why should the word "bharata" mean a sage or an actor when neither sense would suit the context? That neither of the meanings suits the context is plain enough. That a mythical sage should write the Nāṭyaśāstra does not appeal to a reasonable mind; that actor or actors should write it does not answer the common sense point of view. Besides, the other meanings of that word do not seem to have been carefully considered.

1. cf. "The treatise which goes by his (Bharata's) name is very prolix and may be an amplification of the Bhārata sūtras which are lost. It is to these sūtras or stage directions for the use of bharata^s or actors that Bharata owes his imaginary existence" *Ind. Theatre*, p. 30.

"Bharata", as mentioned above, is the name of a Vedic tribe.¹ In the N. S. itself, the bharatas are referred to collectively, as the sons of Bharata.² The literary tradition of the Vedic Aryans is the first reason for such a belief. We know how the authorship of the various Vedic hymns and maṇḍalas had been ascribed to a family, a clan and so on, but least to one individual.³ The maṇḍala VII of the R. V., for example, claims the authorship of the Vasiṣṭhas i.e. of persons whose family name was Vasiṣṭha. Similarly, could not the Bharata of the Nāṭyaśāstra be a family and not an individual? As a matter of fact, in N. S. I are mentioned the hundred sons of Bharata⁴ and they are mentioned again in N. S. XXXVI.

On this supposition much of the traditional account could be reasonably explained. At the beginning it was the Bharata family that was responsible for first introducing the art of dramatic representation. As belonging to the Vedic Aryans it was a family of talents and tradition. A time came, however, when the Bharata family lost its prestige and powers and privileges. Nowhere is it so difficult to continue the family traditions as in arts of instinct. Owing to the questionable attitudes and behaviour of Bharata's sons the very art was threatened with destruction.⁵ Luckily for Bharata, a king by name Nahuṣa came into power over the divine kingdom. This Nahuṣa patronised Bharata and his sons, and Drama has been firmly established ever since.

The above narration is highly instructive. In the first place, it gives us an idea about a family known as Bharata. This family must have been highly cultured, intelligent and respectable.⁶ The fact that other vedic sages cursed the misbehaving sons of Bharata suggests that that was a vedic family.⁶ How sincerely pained must have been these other vedic families when they found a family of their own blood and traditions resorting to vulgar ways like dancing and singing—not in honour of the Gods but to please a vulgar crowd! It is curious that a votary of Dramatic Art should be held in contempt and derision in all climes and at all times. Is it a universal conspiracy of dull minds against daring, of slovenly self-decep-

2. N. S. I. 26-36, XXXVI, 29.

3. C. H. 9, Vol. I, p. 77.

4. For further details in this connexion see and compare the account in the next chapter.

5. Cf. N. S. I. 22.

6. Cf. *Ibid.* XXXVI 33 35 and the next Chapter of this work.

tion against searching self-knowledge, of instinctive animal spirits against inspired art? If we mention that as late as the XVI century, and in a country where Shakespeare was still living, actors were classed as vagabonds it is only to illustrate a universal tendency. In India, too, from the very early times there is evidence to show a similar state of affairs. In one of the earliest treatises on sociology and politics viz., the *Arthaśāstra* ascribed to Kautilya "singing and dancing" are mentioned among the duties of a Śūdra.⁷ Similarly, according to the sage Manu a man conversing with another man's wife commits an offence and is liable to a fine; but, there is an exception. Any one can talk with an actor's wife and no offence is committed! Actors and their wives are so immoral that the question of their moral sentiments being offended does not arise at all.

naiva cāraṇa-dāreṣu vidhir nātmopajīviṣu
sajjayanti hi te nārīṃ nigūḍhās cārayanti te.⁸

"This law does not refer to the wives of actors or to those that maintain themselves by selling their body. They are procurers and work in secrecy."⁹

The higher in art, the lower in life—has been the thumb-and-rule dictum of Society; and the Vedic sages had every human reason to be enraged with Bharata and his sons. The consequence could be easily anticipated. The Bharatas should either recant or should forfeit their Vedic prestige and privileges. Luckily for their art the Bharatas were unrepentant. They chose to leave the neighbourhood of their Vedic brethren. They suffered not for this love of their art, for soon enough the royal patronage of Nahuṣa was extended to them. Who is this Nahuṣa? We do not know for certain. What we do know is that from the Vedic days he is a sore to the eyes of the Aryans. He is the fiend whom Indra, the beloved hero of the Vedic tribes, attacks.

sá nṛtamo náhuṣo armát-sujātaḥ
puro abhinat āraṇa dasyu-bātye.

7. *Sūdrasya dvijāti-śūdrā vārtā kuru-kusilava karma ca. Prakaraṇa I, Chap. iii.*

8. M. S. VIII. 362.

9. "Cāraṇa" mentioned in this verse—has the highest status in the dramatic world as a singer and a dancer. na hi cāryā vinā kincin-nāṭye byāṅgam pravartate—without dance, says Bharata the dramatic art cannot exist. N. S. XI 6.

Thus the word *bharata* in the Nāṭyaśāstra refers in the first instance to some members and descendants of a clan or family of that name. This family was the first sponsor and manager of Dramatic Representation. Either the family heritage was lost or the family ceased, for reasons suggested above, to be recognised as a family. After some time *bharata* meant anyone and everyone who sponsored the art and managed or took part in the production.

CHAPTER V

RELIGION AND DRAMA

The meaning of the word "bharata" as decided in the preceding chapter raises some very inconvenient problems. Those scholars who see in Bharata—the supposed author of the N. S.—only a mythical being easily dismiss the claim of that treatise to any authoritative-ness. Hence, according to them, the origin of Dramatic Representation as narrated in the N. S. is a further myth woven round the name of the mythical Bharata. On the other hand, those scholars have their own theory about the origin of Sanskrit Drama—a theory which is free from any mention of Bharata. The origin of Sanskrit Drama, they say, is to be sought in the primitive religious rites. With the progress of research work this theory has been slightly modified. The older theory traces the origin definitely to the Vedic religious performances. ("The lack of accurate data precludes our knowing much about the origin of the drama in India, but it is probable that it had its beginning in a combination of these hymns in a dramatic and in the religious dances, in which certain pantomimic features came to be conventionalized and stereotyped in later times until we get the classical Sanskrit Drama. This theory is borne out by the fact that in Sanskrit the words for play (nāṭaka) and actor (nāṭa) are from the root *naṭ*, which is the Prākṛt form of Sanskrit *ṇṭ*—to dance."¹) As a corollary to this theory arose that of the probable borrowing of the Drama form in India from the Greeks with whom Drama definitely evolved out of the religious rites.²

A modified version of the above theory is proposed by Professor A. B. Keith. The phrase "Sanskrit Drama," he insists, should be

1. Bib. Skt. Drama 1906, Intro. p. 1. Also cf. "The soma sacrifice which gave rise to Maṇḍala IX of the R̥gveda is also associated with the oldest prahasanas. They were boisterous farces, rough and gruff like the rumbling and grumbling thunderstorm." *The Ind. Theatre*, op. cit. p. 173, footnote.

"The earliest specimens of Bhāṣas in Sanskrit literature are monologues of a ruined gambler R. V. X. 34 and of *Drunken Indra*" *ibid.*, p. 175 footnote.

2. Brit. Drama, p. 15.

understood only in the sense of a conscious representation on an equipped stage. From this point of view, to quote the learned scholar at length, "when we leave out of account the enigmatic dialogues of the R̥gveda we can see that the Vedic ritual contained within itself the germs of drama, as is the case with practically every form of primitive worship. The ritual did not consist merely of the singing of songs or recitations in honour to the Gods; it involved a complex round of ceremonies in some of which there was undoubtedly present the element of dramatic representation, i.e., the performances of the rites assumed for the time being personalities others than their own"³ "On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that it was through the use of the epic recitations that the latent possibilities of drama were evoked and the literary form created."⁴ On these views the writer concludes that Sanskrit Drama originated with the Kṛṣṇa legends during the second century B.C.⁵

All this would tempt one to believe that the origin of Sanskrit Drama ultimately goes back to religious performances, Vedic or epic. The views of these profound scholars cannot be easily dismissed—not even on the ground that as foreigners they do not always have first-hand knowledge and experience of Hindu tradition and mentality. The attempt to connect Sanskrit Drama with some or other aspect of the Vedic life or literature is not quite foreign in its origin. Even Bharata, as explained in the last chapter, mentions that the N. S. was created as the fifth Veda; that the text was taken from R. V., the music from the S. V., the action from the Y. V. and the rasa from the A. V. Secondly in connection with the rise of the four *vṛttis* (NS. XX) the fight of Kṛṣṇa with the demons Madhu and Kaiṭabha is mentioned as the source. Thus on authorities Indian and European, it appears as if the question of the origin of Sanskrit Drama is settled once for all. It would have been, were certain doubts removed by the proposed vedic or epic religious origin. In the first place, the mere mention of the N. S. as the fifth Veda or of the fact that the elements of drama were taken out of the four vedas is of no importance in itself. It has been the age-long tendency of the Hindu mind to trace back everything to the Vedas. Just as a Hindu king would be satisfied to learn that the blood in his veins

3. Skt. Drama, p. 23, Italics ours.

4. *Ibid.* p. 27.

5. *Ibid.* p. 45.

S. L.—3.

has flown direct from a vedic personage so the average Hindu has satisfaction to know that the beliefs and actions of his are exactly those mentioned in the Vedas. Every new school of thought in India has striven to claim and establish for itself the sanction of the vedic texts. So a statement of the kind under question is more a tribute to the sanctity and hold of the Vedas than a reference to a fact.

The Western scholars are on another plane. The facts mentioned by them are usually unquestionable, but oftentimes the conclusions reached by them would not accord with the facts. Though such latter cases are very few indeed, the origin of Sanskrit Drama is one of them; though best-equipped to know the facts it is most natural for these scholars to ignore the feelings behind them. Thus a connection between religious performances and dramatic representation is a probability to them not because there are all the stronger reasons for it in India, but that such has been the case in civilisations more intimately connected with their own. In Greece, for example, "both comedy and tragedy took their rise from religious ceremonial From a common chant the ceremonial soon developed into a primitive *duologue* between a leader and the chorus. The song became elaborated; it developed narrative elements and soon reached a stage in which the duologue told in primitive wise some story of the deity."⁶ Similar circumstances obtained even in England "The very Mass itself is an effort in this direction. The whole of this service with its accompanying ritual is a symbolic representation of the most arresting episodes in the life of Christ, and it is but natural that the clergy should have attempted to make it even more outwardly symbolic, as the knowledge of Latin among ordinary people passed further and further into the background."⁷

Such authoritative remarks show us the reasonableness of the connexion between Religion and Drama. But the difficulty in the case of India is the different state and the different course of her religion. The days of Greece were the days of democracy; while in the theory of Christianity every member of that religion had a kind of natural and equal status. In both these cases religion and religious ceremonies involved a free mixing on a large scale of all the followers. But in India, it has been different from the very beginning. In religion as well as in social life, both in theory and in practice, there

6 Brit. Drama, p. 15.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 20.

has been an assertive superiority (and a graded segregation) of the learned over the ignorant, of the ruler over the ruled, of the Aryans over the non-Aryans and later still of the Brahmins over the so-called lower castes. Religious performances were rarely communal in the sense of a social gathering; they were the monopoly of Brahmins at first and of a priest-class later; and others were practically barred from an active participation. The Vedic hymns were declared "untouchable" to any except Brahmins or Priests. As a result these hymns became the property of pedantic scholars interested, more than anything, in hair-splitting interpretations. There was nothing popular about such a development. The ignorant and the lower castes played no part in social or cultural life. And Drama, we are told, originated for such persons and purposes.

na veda-vyavahāro'yam samśrāvyam śūdra-jātuṣu
tasmāt srjāparam vedam pañcamam sārvaṇyamkam.*

"These Vedic texts (or practices) are not to be heard by (i.e. are not accessible to) the Śūdras, create a new and a fifth Veda accessible to all the castes."

In answer to this prayer of the Gods, Brahmā created Drama. It is interesting to note that everything connected with Drama is associated with lower castes. It so happened, the N. S. tells us, that the sons of Bharata became too arrogant on account of their dramatic art. The traditional sages resented and cursed every one of them. "You shall lose your art since you are so arrogant and ill-mannered. You shall lose the Brahmin culture and shall take to the ways of the Śūdras. We hereby degrade you to the Śūdras' status. Your descendants shall be perpetually born into the Śūdra caste." * Not only the Art and advocates but even the first patron of Drama was an anti-Vedic if not a non-Aryan King. King Nahuṣa whom we know from the early Vedic days¹⁰ and who figures even in the epic literature¹¹ is spoken of as the first patron of drama in the mortal world.¹² His very name 'na-huṣ' (non-sacrificer) speaks of anti-Vedic tendencies and his quarrels with the Gods and the Brahmins are handed down in legendary lore.

8. N. S. I-12.

9. N. S. XXXVI, 34-37.

10. See Vedic Index under "Nahuṣa."

11. M.B.H. III 183.

12. N. S. XXXVI, 48 ff.

From the foregoing discussions it seems likely that Sanskrit Drama has least to do with religion or religious rites ; that it is the work of people treated as anti-Vedic, if not as non-Aryan, fiends, and that its origins are to be sought in the interests of the lower castes and its patron in a king—a non-Aryan adventurer.

Before hastening to any conclusion from the above deductions, we shall deal with a point which is also likely to suggest a popular, non-religious origin of Sanskrit Drama. That point concerns itself with dumb shows.

‘
‘

.



CHAPTER VI

DUMB SHOW AND DRAMATIC REPRESENTATION

(Drama, to Bharata, means a representation by means of speeches and actions. Mere imitation, it seems, is not admitted by Bharata as drama unless it is followed by words and actions ; for, he speaks of drama in these words :

evam budhaḥ param bhāvam soṣṃti manasā smaraṇ¹
vāg-aṅga-gati-līlābhīṣeṣṭābhīṣca samācaret. (XXXV-14).

"Where by means of gestures, physical and verbal, a clever actor identifies himself with the person and the situation he represents.")

With these views of his, Bharata can never be expected to subscribe to the view that drama originated in a puppet or a pantomime show. No doubt, we can believe the existence in ancient India of such shows. Even in the modern days the Indian villagers have retained the puppet shows, probably in the same form in which they must have existed then. Thus, we read in the Mahābhārata :

yathā dārumayīm yoṣām naraḥ sthira-samāhitaḥ
iṅgayatyaṅgam aṅgāni tathā rājann imāḥ prajāḥ.¹

"Just as a man, without moving himself, moves the wooden dolls, so, Oh King, does the Lord with each and every being."

Further we have the view of some scholars who hold that the Sūtradhāra or the stage-manager in Sanskrit plays is an evidence of earlier puppet shows (Skt. *sūtra*, a thread ; hence Sūtradhāra means one who holds the thread or the agent behind the puppet shows). Prof. Keith seems to recognise such a stage in the evolution of Sanskrit Drama. "We seem in fact"² says he "to have in the Mahābhāṣya evidence of a stage in which all the elements of a drama were present ; we have acting in dumb show, if not with words also." Lastly, Bharata himself may be said to suggest an origin from such dumb shows when, as already described, he traces the four *vr̥ttis* of a drama to a fight between Kṛṣṇa and the demons. Thus it would appear

1. Quoted by Madhva in his *Brahma-Sūtra-Bhāṣya*, II, i. 24.

2. Skt. Drama, p. 36.

that later dramatic representation originated, as likely as not, from puppet and dumb shows or from recitational shows based on them.

There are, however, obvious miscalculations in such a hypothesis. We are not quite so sure if the puppet shows were a regular amusement. We have no reference in the two Sanskrit authorities on dramaturgy, the N. S. and the D. R.—to the puppet shows, nor is there any indication thereof either. On the other hand, it might be argued—and not unreasonably—that the puppet shows were merely the substitute of the populace for the dramatic luxury of the intellectuals. Even Bharata's account of the four *vittis* from recitation to representation, might not be referring to Vedic recitations or to God-and-demon fights. Lastly, the significance of the word *Sūtradhāra* seems to have been missed. If the *Sūtradhāra* were doll-dancer of the popular puppet shows his name would most likely have descended to us in Prākṛt or some other non-Sanskrit form. In contrast to that of the word *naṭī* (see Chap. VIII below) the form of the word "*Sūtradhāra*" is Sanskrit. There are some indications in earlier literature which show that the word "*Sūtradhāra*" was coined for purposes quite different. In the first book of the *Mahābhārata*, King Janamejaya is about to perform a sacrifice. The sacrificial ground had to be prepared. In that context we read :

sthāpatṛ buddhisampanno vāstu-vidyā-viśāradaḥ
ityabravīt sūtradhāraḥ sūto paurāṇikas tadā.³

"Then the *Sūta Paurāṇika* who was an expert on land and building, the *sūtradhāra* said thus"

The *Paurāṇika Sūta* is here said to be an expert on land and sculpture and along with this he is called a *sūtradhāra*. Why? The next line gives a sufficient clue to the answers

yasmin deśe ca kāle ca māpaneyam pravartitam

"The time and the place where the measurements were to be taken."

It seems that the *Sūta* was a man who used to measure out the grounds for sacrificial purposes. For this work of an expert he was called a *śilpāgamavettā*. (Cf. the commentary on the above verse.) That an expert on "*Śilpa—sculpture*" was called a *Sūtradhāra* could be said with greater justification on the authority of some other

references, as the one from Act II of *Mudrā-Rākṣasa*. At the time of Candraguta's entry into the palace all the *Sūtradhāras* of the capital were commanded by Cāṇakya to decorate the streets as far as the palace gates. The more we read the word "*Sūtradhāra*" in this context the more are we convinced that a *Sūtradhāra* was more than a carpenter and had something to do with land and building. It was on account of this work that he was called a *Sūtradhāra*, i.e., one who holds out a thread. He took the measurements of the ground by means of a thread. And if we are to believe it, Bharata says the same thing when he describes that a ground for an auditorium and a stage has to be set apart. We have already described how, owing to the obstruction of the demons a *nāṭyaveśma*, i.e., a play-house was found an essential pre-requisite to Bharata, the Producer. The ground had to be measured out; the process is described to be very delicate and dangerous, so an expert had to be called in. This was the *Sūta*, already referred to in the *Mbh.* as the *Sūtradhāra*.

puṣya-nakṣatra yoge tu śuklam sūtram prasārayet.

"A white piece of thread should be stretched out at (the auspicious time of) the conjunction of *puṣya*." 4

This is one of the reasons why the *Sūtradhāra* enters at the very opening of a play. In the passage from the *Mbh.* quoted above he is also called a "*Sthā-pati*"—one who arranges the ground plot. Probably on this analogy the prologue in early plays is called a "*Sthāpanā*." The *Sūta* is the *Sūtradhāra*; the work of the "*Sthā-pati*" is the "*Sthāpanā*."

If thus the *Sūtradhāra* or the *Sthāpati* is the *Sūta* himself we shall have to modify our views about the origin of dramatic representation. The puppet shows would now be thrown into the background and our search will have to follow the footsteps of the *Sūta*. The *Sūta*, as mentioned already, was a professional reciter. As time went on, this recitation might naturally have been accompanied by music and instruments. From the fanciful account in the *N. S.* 5 it appears probable that a musician and an instrumentalist were somehow called "*kuśilava*." It should be noted in this connection that the epic *Rāmāyaṇa* of *Vālmīki* was sung before *Rāma* to the accompaniment of musical instrument. The two singers—the sons of *Rāma*

4. *N. S.* II, 28, cf. the verses following also in this connection.

5. *nāṭyodyavidhāne prayogayuktaḥ pravādane kuśilav* "One who is an expert in playing on various musical instruments" XXXV, 84.

as yet unrecognised by the latter—were Kuśa and Lava by name. In any case we might well understand the Sūta being accompanied by the Kuśilavas, so much so that at the stage of dramatic representation when the Sūta turned into a Sūtradhāra, the Kuśilavas turned into pāripāśvakas, i.e., those who kept by the side of Sūtradhāra and played music.

Acceptance of the above suggestions would lead us back to a reconsideration of the four *vyttis* mentioned by Bharata. It was the Sūta, the wandering minstrel, who must have been responsible, by accident or through experience, for the introduction of Dramatic Representation. Alone he could only recite. In the company of the Kuśilavas he might seek the aid of the latter either by way of a kind of chorus or by actually helping him with certain portions in the recitation. The form of the two epics was specially favourable to such a division of labour. The major part of the Mahābhārata and a fairly good portion of the Rāmāyaṇa are composed of dialogues. So the Sūta and the Kuśilavas could carry on the dialogue with greater effect. In the form of the epics there is no mention in the body of the verses as to who is speaking. Outside the verses we have sub-headings as 'Yudhiṣṭhira uvāca,' 'Sūta uvāca,' 'Draupadī uvāca' ("Y. said," "S. said," "D. said") and so on. In a representation such a sub-heading was not necessary. At the very commencement of the recitation the Sūta would announce the rôles to be played. Curiously enough, in many of the existing plays, we have an identical circumstance where the Sūtradhāra tells the audience, then and there, the rôle he is going to assume. (Thus, in the prologue to the Mṛcchakatika, the Sūtradhāra says : *eṣo'smi bhoḥ kāryavaśāt prayogavaśāt ca prākṛta-bhāṣī samvṛttaḥ* "Here, sirs, I am going to speak in Prākṛt because of my part to be played" A more interesting reference is in the plays of Bhavabhūti—interesting because Bhavabhūti has a first-hand experience of the actors.⁶ The Sūtradhāra in the U. R. says "*eṣo'smi bhoḥ kāryavaśād āyodhyikas tadānīntanaśca samvṛttaḥ*. Here I have turned myself, for the action of the play, into a citizen of Ayodhyā of Rāma's days." Similarly at the end of the prologue to MM the Sūtradhāra and his friend

6. Bhavabhūti is described as *nisarga-sauhrdena bharateṣu vartamānaḥ*, "who lived, naturally attracted, in the company of actors" (Prologue MM.); Kavir mitradheyam asmākam, "the poet is our personal friend" says the Sūtradhāra, (Prologue M. V. C.).

assume then and there the rôles of Kāmandākī and Avalokitā respectively.)

There is one more reason to hold that the Sūtradhāra is the original Sūta. In almost all the plays it is the Sūtradhāra that introduces to the audience the life and lineology of the dramatist. In the earlier days this was one of the duties of the Sūta who had to study and describe the life and lineology of gods, sages, kings and great men.⁷ No one was more fitted for the task.

It was thus the post-epic Sūta and not the puppet shows that originated dramatic representation ; the recitation of the epic and not that of religious hymns is the Bhāratī stage ; the recitation of the sūta and the kuśilavas, the Sātvatī stage ; in the Kaiśikī vṛtti the dancer naṭī was introduced ; the Arabhaṭī is the final mode of " full dress " staging and from its beginning to its death, Sanskrit drama took its hero from the Sūta and the epics that he recited and never, never, from the religious lore or from the host of Vedic gods.

7. Cf. C. H. I. Vol. I, p 237.

CHAPTER VII

ORIGIN OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

(Conclusion)

We are now in a position to view the question of the origin of Sanskrit Drama from a broader view-point. It should be remembered that by drama, in this connection, is meant dramatic representation. In the first place, the chief person connected with the representational form of drama is the Sūta who had achieved great reputation soon after the epics (This Sūta was a professional reciter par excellence.) In course of time he gathered round him two or more musicians and instrumentalists.) In the early days the Sūta could be expected to represent dramatically the traditional and the mythological episodes which it was his profession to learn and recite. (We have shown in an earlier place¹ that the word nāṭaka originally meant only the representation of traditional or mythological episodes. There is an interesting passage in the Nāṭyaśāstra which throws some light on the initial stages of such representation. With reference to nāṭaka and prakaraṇa—two early varieties of drama—a big number of characters is prohibited.

na mahājana-parivāram kartavyam nāṭakam prakaraṇam vā
ye tatra kāryāḥ puruṣāś catvārah pañca vā te syuḥ²

“In a nāṭaka or prakaraṇa it is not advisable to have a crowd of characters; four or five would do.” The Sūta and his musical friends were perhaps to answer for this small number of characters.)

Thus did Sanskrit Drama originate soon after the epics. But before it assumed its rightful place as one of the most simple and straightforward means of expression and education and entertainment it had to fight a hard, hard battle. To start with, the chief person connected with drama was the Sūta, a man of respectable tradition but of inferior blood.³ Even the Vedic traditions condemned the

1. Chapter III

2. N. S. XX 40.

3. In the laws of Manu the Sūta is classed as a cāṇḍāla the ancestor of the modern untouchables X 26

Sūta, after a time, to a degraded position.⁴ The legend in the N.S. of the Bharatas cursed to a Śūdra status tells the same tale in the language of a different generation.

Even popular sympathy would not carry with it the Sūta and his band. Soon after the epics came the Emperor Aśoka under whose reign all kinds of amusements were banned. It is more than probable that in his Gurnar Rock Edict I⁵ King Aśoka refers, by the word "samāja," to an audience or assembly such as that entertained by the Sūta. King Piyadasi sees many dangers in a Samāja. "bahukam hi dosam samājahmi pasati devānam piyo piyadasi rājā" says the emperor. We do not say the word "samāja" refers only to dramatic representation⁶; however we would insist that the idea of a "Samāja" *does* include the audience of a dramatic representation. Even in later Sanskrit plays we find an audience usually addressed as *pariṣad*, an assembly (of connoisseurs).⁷ That at some time, the Sūta addressed such pariṣads, open of course to the general public of taste, is obvious from the vehement attack in the laws of Manu against such pariṣads conducted by the Sūta and composed of persons not soaked with Vedic lores.

avratānām amantrāṇām jātimātropajivinām
sahasraśaḥ sametānām pariṣattvam navidyate⁸

"Even thousands would not constitute a pariṣad if they are undisciplined, un-initiated and if they make it a *profession of maintenance*."

In some of the later plays the words "Samāja" and "Sāmājika" are used in the sense of "an audience" and "a member of an audience" respectively. It could be added without hesitation that the words "Samāja" and "Pariṣad" are synonymous in this respect. In the Mālav. of Kālidāsa, the hero-king has to watch the dancing performance of Mālavikā. (Act I). "Let us be sāmājika-s" (devi, sāmājika bhavāmaḥ) says he to the queen. Similarly in the Prologue to the Rat. of Śrī Haṛṣa the Sūtradhāra says that he has attracted the attention of the sāmājika-s i.e audience (aye, āvarjītāni

4. cf. C. H. I. Vol. I, p. 297.

5. Dr. Woolner's edition.

6. Vide "Samāja" in the Glossary *ibid*.

7. Cf. abhirūpa-bhūyiṣṭhā pariṣad iyaṃ "this house mostly consists of experts" (Prologue A. Śāk.)

8. M. S. XII 114.

sakala-sāmājikānām mīanāmsi iti me nīścayah) In the Prologue to Jayadeva's Prasanna-Rāghava likewise the Sūtradhāra sees his actor-friend coming from through the audience with a message from the latter : nūnam etad-abhisamdhānād eva sāmājika-samājād ito' bhivartate sakhā me raṅga-tarangah). The actor-friend comes in and says, "Sir, the audience (sāmājikāh) send you this instruction through me" (bhāva, idam manmukheria eva bhavantam udīrayanti sāmājikāh). These and many other references of the kind would bear out the interpretation of the word "samāja" as the audience of a dramatic performance. Such *samājas* were prohibited by the Emperor who ruled over the largest Indian Empire in history. Could we believe, as history would have us believe in all such cases, that the *samājas* flourished for the simple reason that they were prohibited? Any healthy institution in history that has been attempted to be suppressed by royal or religious rigour has either run underground into uncouth, uncultivated hands or rubber-like, has bounced with doubled vigour and vivacity. Nothing more natural, then, than that the *samājas* should have persisted—though in constant fear of the authorities. There was, however, a greater chance for such *samājas* to flourish in those parts of the Empire, where Aśoka's power only hung like a shadow. Thus in southern as well as in western India could be expected a survival of and an encouragement to the *samājas*. History has some evidence to show that Sanskrit was patronised more and more in the west and in the south soon after, as well as during Aśoka's reign. This is the beginning of the revival of Sanskrit, which culminated in the shifting of the centre of culture and learning to Ujjain in the west. Most of the kings that patronised this revival were either the non-Aryan Kings in the south or the later non-Indian invaders in the west of India. We have already mentioned how the Bharatas wandered through the modern Rajputana to the south of India. If, in these circumstances, Bharata says that King Nahuṣa is the first patron, he has more reasons to say so and more cleverness in saying it.

CHAPTER VIII

THE EARLY STAGES OF THE DEVELOPMENT

(*Sūtradhāra, nāṭi, prastāvanā and sthāpanā*).

In the preceding chapter we saw, in connection with the origin of Sanskrit Drama, the importance of the Sūta who later on came to be recognised, in the dramatic world, as the Sūtradhāra. As a matter of fact, in all the Sanskrit plays available, the first character to appear on the stage is the Sūtradhāra. We shall here attempt to sketch the career of the Sūtradhāra in the world of dramatic performances.

(As already mentioned, the Sūtradhāra is usually accompanied by the musicians. It is not, however, necessary that it must be *always* so. Whether he is alone or whether he is in the company of the musicians and the dancers his one function is to introduce the piece of performance to the (as he always says it, learned) audience. After performing the usual worshipping ceremony (not necessarily in the presence of the audience) he steps on the stage and informs the audience of the play and its contents. Remembering the fact that in the earlier days it was the Sūta himself who did this work in his recitation, we need not expect him, any and every time, to introduce his subject or to explain the context and so on. The earliest representational form did not require any such intermittent introductions. Therein the story as well as the hero were too well known.¹ The various episodes and legends of the epics were already too popular to need description; contemporary episodes and events would not as well need any separate mention; and thus, in the earliest plays, the Sūtradhāra entered the stage just formally to initiate the play. In the existing Sanskrit plays this feature can be observed very frequently. Wherever the story and the characters are too well known the Sūtradhāra merely mentions them. In the A. Śāk. of Kālidāsa, for example, the story is a traditionally popular one. The Sūtradhāra merely mentions the title and the story is immediately known to the audience. Where, however, the story is

1. Cf. the definition of nāṭaka in N. S. XX 10 "prakhyāta-nāyaka" "prakhyāta-vastu-viśaya" "well known hero" "well known plot."

not so universally known he describes it for the audience. A good example is the *Mṛch. of Śūdraka*. Here the *Sūtradhāra* presents the audience with a synopsis. "There lived a Brahmin merchant named *Cārudatta* in *Ujjain*. In his poverty, only his mistress *Vasantasenā* was attached to his virtues. A love-affair between the Brahmin and her, like the vernal splendour, is dramatized by king *Śūdraka* who has depicted therein the ways of the world, the wickedness of life and men and Fate."²

The three plays of *Bhavabhūti* are also an illustration in this respect. In *U. R.* the story is well known and it is merely mentioned; and the same holds true of the *prastāvanā* in *Act VII* to the play within the play. In *MM.* the whole story is narrated by *Kāmandakī* which rôle the *Sūtradhāra* himself has taken. The *Sūtradhāra* of *Bhavabhūti* is always more skilful in first assuming a rôle contemporary with the story. In certain cases where only parts of a well known story are dramatized the *Sūtradhāra* explains the context. Thus in *M. V. C.* the actor-friend says to the *Sūtradhāra* : *krta-prasādāḥ pāriśadāḥ. kim tu apūrvatvāt prabandhasya kathā-pradeśam samārambhe śrotum icchanti.* "The audience is humoured, but as the play is unusually constructed, it wants to know at the very beginning the particular part of the story" (of *Rāmāyaṇa*). Similarly in the *V. S.* of *Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa*, dealing with the well-known epic story of the *Kauravas* and the *Pāṇḍavas*, the *Sūtradhāra* gives an idea of what part of the epic story has been dramatized. With this can be compared the statement in the *U. R.* "*atrabhāvataḥ ... Mahārāja-rāmasya ayam patṭābhiṣeka-samayah.*" "This is the coronation function of *Rāma*"—whereby *Bhavabhūti* informs the audience that he has dramatized the *Rāmāyaṇa* story subsequent to *Rāma's* coronation.)

The above illustrations are mentioned only to point out the functions of the *Sūtradhāra*. In this respect, the Sanskrit *Sūtradhāra* evolved like the Prologues of *Euripides*. The Greek tragedian found Prologues necessary since his story or treatment was usually out-of-the-way sort. In Sanskrit Dramas the *Sūtradhāra* appeared even where the story was well-known. This difference is due to the fact that the *Sūtradhāra* was there even before the Sanskrit Drama while the Prologues of *Euripides* came in as a device long after the Greek Drama.

(There is another function of the Sūtradhāra which must have been one of the earliest. After informing the audience of the play etc. he immediately, but giving an intimation to the audience beforehand, assumes a rôle in the play. We have already given instances of this nature. In the early days the sketches must have been such as were conveniently composed of a few characters; the art of "make-up" i.e. the *nepathya* must have been unknown or unavailed of. So the Sūtradhāra, at one stroke of his word, assumed the rôle required and in the new capacity introduced the other characters as well. That the Sūtradhāra *did* introduce all the characters may be reasonably imagined on the analogy of the modern village shows where on the first entry of any character, he asks the name, the purpose of the arrival and other details thereof.

Performing as he did these various functions, the Sūtradhāra was known as the Sthāpaka. As Bharata tells us³ the Sūtradhāra is himself the Sthāpaka when he opens the play.

prayujya vidhinaivam tu pūrvaraṅgam prayogataḥ
sthāpakasḥ pravīśet tatra sūtradhāra-guṇākṛtḥ

"After the initiatory stage worship should enter the sthāpaka, whose garb and functions are the same as those of the Sūtradhāra.")

As Viśwanātha, the author of the S. D., explains later on, the Sthāpaka was, for all practical purposes, known as the Sūtradhāra. The scene in which the Sūtradhāra entered as Sthāpaka was known as the sthāpanā "foundation, ground work, opening," or Prologue. (Thus we have sthāpanās in all the plays ascribed to Bhāsa. (In most of them the Sūtradhāra (he is not styled as Sthāpaka here) alone enters the stage to introduce the story and the situation and the characters to the audience.)

(As Dramatic Art progressed things must have developed. We have already seen how music and dance were gradually introduced into such representations. With the addition of these features the functions of the Sūtradhāra had to be modified. He need no longer introduce the play in the dry, formal manner or in an equally abrupt way. (cf. the sthāpanās in Bhāsa's plays where the Sūtradhāra is immediately made to listen to some words, from behind the stage which he goes on to explain with reference to a context in the plot.)

danseuse and such we find her in most of the plays. She was in no better advantage, except in her natural charm and grace, than the Kuśilavas who were also musicians. And yet the advent of naṭī marked the rarity, if not the total disappearance, of the Kuśilavas in the dramatic world. Such is the conquest of charm and grace and delicacy in the world of Art! It is always the shrewd, keen-eyed Eve that is attracted by the Forbidden Fruit and then tempts the clumsy Adam on to it. Whether it was the Sūtradhāra, or the audience that was tempted first, the fact is clear that as time went on the Sūtradhāra and the naṭī are thrown more and more together. In some later plays like the Mrch., the Rat., or the M. R. the naṭī is represented as the wife of the Sūtradhāra. She is not addressed as ārye (oh! noble lady) merely but as "my dear" and all that by the Sūtradhāra. Was she the wife of the Sūtradhāra or the wife of the Sthāpaka? In the first case, we have to imagine a *hereditary professional caste of naṭīs*; in the second, *merely a professional class*. A close perusal of Sanskrit plays would tempt one to believe that there gradually arose a hereditary professional caste of actors. In the prologue to the Rat. the Sūtradhāra tells his wife (gṛhīṇī) that his younger brother has dressed himself up in the rôle of Yaugandharāyaṇa (nanu ayam mama yaviyān bhrātā gṛhīta-yaugandharāyaṇa-bhūmikāḥ prāpta eva). By the time of Harṣa (607 A.D.—640 A.D.) we can believe in the existence of such a caste. Leaving aside the momentary inconveniences of some settled views in chronology we might take it as a fairly general rule that plays where the naṭī is represented as the wife of the Sūtradhāra are later in age. The M.R., for example, gives interesting details of the relations between these two characters. The Sūtradhāra addresses his wife in these words. :

guṇavati upāyanīlaye sthiti-heto sādhike trivargasya,
madbhavana-nīti-vidye kuryād ārye drutam apaihi

"Diligent and resourceful, you are the guide of my life; virtuous as you are, you are my helpmate to the Higher Truths; you are my domestic deity, presiding over the art of management etc."

To resume the narration. The naṭī thus became a permanent member of the Sūtradhāra band. With the aid of the Kuśilavas and the naṭī, the Sūtradhāra could entertain the audience and at the same time inform them of the play, the plot, the characters and

so on. His work now was not mere *sthāpanā* or introduction but introduction with amusement or, to use the technical words of Sanskrit dramaturgy, the *sthāpanā* was now called a *prastāvanā*. The *prastāvanā* was originally nothing else but the music, the singing in praise (the Skt. root 'stu'—means "to praise") of the seasonal charm. It was the music essentially that made the difference between the *sthāpanā* and the *prastāvanā*. It is only in some later plays like the M. R. or the V. S. that we read of a *prastāvanā* with no music on the stage. Music and not necessarily the *naṭi*, is the distinctive feature of the *prastāvanā*, and hence even the Kuśālavas turned a *sthāpanā* into a *prastāvanā*. It would be unnecessary to stress the point too much since the Prologue was soon enough standardised.

Lastly, one more feature must be pointed out which is persistent in and characteristic of all Prologues. It is a commonplace that in any ballad-singing attention is first attracted and then retained by establishing personal relations with the audience. This tendency must have existed in the earlier plays, more so since those performances were given in the open. No ruse would serve the purpose better than flattering the audience to the skies. Even in modern folk-songs this feature is not to be missed. Similarly the *Sūta* and the other bards and ballad-singers in the early days praised their audience. The *Sūtradhāra* of Sanskrit plays does the same. He addresses his audience, as "noble sirs" (*āryamiśra*) "learned" (*vidvat*), "appreciative (*guṇa-grāhin*)" and so on. This feature of taking the audience into the dramatist's confidence and of establishing a personal relationship between the actors and the audience is to be found in early literature of other countries as well. We can compare the tone of Kālidāsa's Prologue to his A. Śāk. (where he says that he would not deem his performance a success unless the learned audience is pleased (*ā paritoṣād viduṣāṃ na sādhu manye prayogavijñānam*)) with, for example, the chorus in Aristophanes' *Frogs* :

Fear not for a want of sense,
Or judgment in your audience,
That defect has been removed
They're prodigiously improved.
Thus their own ingenious natures
Aided and improved by learning,

Will provide you with spectators

Shrewd, attentive and discerning.*

We might as well mention, before we conclude, one difference in this respect between the Sanskrit and the early Greek plays. Personal relationship is maintained in both; but, while in Sanskrit plays the Sūtradhāra or the prastāvanā alone is utilised for this purpose, in Greek, besides the chorus, even the characters within the play address the audience. Thus, again in *Frogs* :

Bacchus :—Do you see the villains and the perjurers that he told us of?

Xanthias :—Yes, plain enough, don't you?

Bacchus :—Ah, now I see them, indeed, quite plain and now too.

(*Turning to the audience*)†

Has it not been mentioned that the Greek drama was more democratic than the Sanskrit? At the very start they part ways.

6. Plays by Aristophanes (Dent's edition), pp. 60-61.

7. *Ibid.* p. 16.

CHAPTER IX

PLOT-DEVELOPMENT IN SANSKRIT PLAYS

(The *Viṣkambhaka* and the *Praveśaka*)

The play was introduced first of all to the audience. In that connection we saw that the *Sūtradhāra* was responsible mainly for the introduction to, and partly for the personal touch with, the audience. It should not, however, be supposed that the responsibility of the *Sūtradhāra* ended then and there. As the stage-manager he was responsible for the whole show. In this chapter we shall see if the *Sūtradhāra* had any other functions besides introducing the play and its general management.

Drama, as suggested in connection with its origin, was a representation of selections. Whenever a story is represented it should not be supposed, and it will never be found possible either, to represent each and every incident in all its details. The central theme might be a heroic deed or a noble truth; some relevant points are represented so that the central theme is set in brighter relief. Besides, from the early days, drama had had the advantage of being a complete unit by itself. Thus the story in any play proceeded along broader lines while the minor and relevant details were summarised in their proper places for the convenience of the audience. This is what is meant by plot-development here.

How, then, was a representational story developed in the earlier days? In the very beginning we can believe the *Sūta* or the *Sūtradhāra* shouldering responsibility in this respect for any representation. If it were the dialogues from the epics the *Sūta* would recite in company with his musicians; passages that were not in dialogue form either the *Sūta* recited alone or summarised. We could say all this if there were any evidence to warrant the existence of such a representational form in the earlier days. There is, however, no definite evidence for such a hypothesis. If at all we are to judge by comparisons we must go back to some other country or civilization. In connection with "Religion and Drama" it was shown how dangerous it would be to judge by comparisons. Nevertheless, we cannot pass over a circumstance that obtains in some of the earlier

Greek plays. In establishing a personal relation with the audience it was seen how closely, functionally and favourably the Sūtradhāra compared with the Greek chorus. The chorus had not this only function. "We can see that the chorus was also capable of fulfilling a very useful function. It served to punctuate the stages of the action (as the drop curtain now serves to divide scene from scene, but with the disadvantage of arresting it entirely). It gave a convenient interval, during which important events might be supposed to happen off the stage . . . and, above all, it gave the poet an opportunity of commenting and moralizing upon the progress of the events in the play proper."¹ Thus it was the chorus which kept the audience, once the play commenced, in touch with the continuity of the action.

How was it done in the earlier Sanskrit dramatic representations? Could we suppose that like the Greek chorus the Sanskrit Sūtradhāra too, played an important part in the plot development?

A glance at some of these Sanskrit plays would reveal that from a known period this kind of plot-development was carried out in a peculiar way. There was nothing like a chorus or any character or characters equivalent to it to keep the audience in touch with the events off the stage. On the other hand, some characters in the play itself were utilised for the purpose; further, the type of characters used in this way seems to have been fixed—since the traditional authorities on dramaturgy not only recognised that fact but turned it into a kind of a technicality to be strictly observed by dramatists. Two varieties of such a technique are recognised—one known as Viṣkambhaka and the other as Praveśaka. Three authorities (N.S., D. R., and S. D.) define them in practically identical phrases. In the D. R. these two are defined as

- (i) Vṛtta-vartisyamāṇāṁ kathāṁśānāṁ nidarśakah
samkṣēpārthas tu viṣkambho madhyapātra-prayojitaḥ (I-59)

"A Viṣkambhaka is that which summarises, through characters of an intermediate status, past and future incidents," and

- (ii) tadvad-evānudāttoktyā nūca-pātra-prayojitaḥ
praveśonka-dvayasyāntaḥ śeṣārthasyopasūcakah (I. 60)

"A praveśa(ka) is similar, only the characters are of a lower status, and the praveśa itself appears in between two acts. The

1. C. E. Robinson, *The Genius of the Greek Drama*, Intro. p. 16.

preted could also be conveyed to the audience through the *viṣkambhaka*. Thus in *Vik. Act. III*, the *viṣkambhaka* plays an important part in the development of the story, so much so that a complete idea of the course to be run by the story, is suggested only thereby. The two disciples of Bharata manage to convey to the audience how *Urvaśi* is to be re-united with *Vikrama*, how she loves the hero, and how long she would live with the hero. With this information got already the audience is quite prepared to sympathise with *Vikrama*, first in *Act IV*, when *Urvaśi* is lost to him and then in *Act V* when *Urvaśi* leaves him. The major part of the main scene in *Act IV* is, under these circumstances, more a lyrical passage than a lunatic's raving. This example shows us the *viṣkambhaka* in a slightly new light. In plays where the whole story is already known to the audience there is no practical necessity of letting the audience know the incidents left out or supposed to have taken place during the interval. Like that of *Vikrama* and *Urvaśi* the story of *Duṣyanta* and *Śakuntalā* too was well known from the days of the *Mahābhārata*. Theoretically there was thus no need of and no place for the *viṣkambhaka*. But *viṣkambhakas* there are in *A. Śāk.* The explanation is obvious, as an analysis would show. The *viṣkambhaka* would not be strictly necessary in such a story if it is to be represented precisely as in the original. But when the dramatist introduces changes, the audience must be informed if its sympathy and interest are to be retained. The changes of an able dramatist would, of course, be such as would affect the main incidents concerning the hero and the heroine. Thus we come back to what has been just said about the *viṣkambhaka*, viz., it is concerned with incidents unrepresented on the stage, or supposed to have happened during the interval and also incidents connected with the hero and the heroine or the central theme. In the instance quoted above (*Vik. III*) it is not a new episode, that has been introduced; but a new meaning, a new place, and a new significance have been given to the one already known; and the playwright conveys it to the audience through the *viṣkambhaka*. Similarly in *Mālav.* the *viṣkambhaka* is to be found in the very first act where the whole background, of the play, has been painted with lines suggestive of the future incidents. The story of king *Agnimitra* and his love-affairs might not have been so popular but the *viṣkambhaka* in the beginning promises some interesting developments.

Of a greater interest and a greater importance still are the two

viṣkambhakas in A. Śāk—one in Act III and the other in Act IV. The story of the play, as mentioned so often, was sufficiently popular. Kālidāsa, however, does not seem to have written the play for the interest and estimate it had with the populace. His interest was not merely to represent dramatically the traditional story. In Act III there is a viṣkambhaka which is very short and thus very easy to analyse. In this viṣkambhaka the whole of Act III has been brilliantly and artistically introduced. Duṣyanta's love for Śakuntalā has been sufficiently revealed so far. Now the first thing that the audience knows from the viṣkambhaka is that Śakuntalā is not keeping well. But the words used are enough to suggest to the audience of those days what this "un-wellness" is. (Ātapa-langhanād bala-vad-aśvastha-śarīrā Śakuntalā). The whole of Act III—Śakuntalā writing a love letter, Duṣyanta overhearing her when she reads it out to her friends etc.—is the pure invention of the dramatist. A dramatic situation is created to bring together the hero and the heroine when both of them are mad and blind with love. What would happen when they meet each other? What if this love's intrigue would lead, in this stage of madness, to something beyond the limits of reason or decency? All may be fair in love but it would not be fair to talk of all that afterwards. But Kālidāsa gives no chance for the audience to feel unnecessarily virtuous, not even out of neighbourly considerations. In the viṣkambhaka itself the Śiṣya informs the audience, that, after all, the venerable Gautamī would come to see Śakuntalā. As a matter of fact Gautamī does come in just to prevent Duṣyanta from flouting stage etiquette. That the audience both demanded and understood such assurances could be reasonably believed, since Kālidāsa himself describes it in his prologue as "cultured" (abhi-rūpa bhūyiṣṭhā pariśad iyaṃ); at least Kālidāsa wrote only for such an audience.

Likewise the viṣkambhaka in Act IV prepares the audience, in a clever way, for the new incidents and the original interpretation of the dramatist. To start with, Kālidāsa has invented a situation and that situation has been described at length, viz., the part to be played by the ring; secondly, that the whole episode should be interpreted as a tragedy in the highest sense is suggested throughout the viṣkambhaka. The disturbing calmness of the undisturbed morn, the uneasiness of the friends, Duṣyanta not sending any message, the lonely and forlorn figure of Śakuntalā seated at the door of the hut, the uncouth outburst of a choleric sage who has reasons to pronounce

an unkind curse—all this is suggestive of the atmosphere into which the play proceeds from now on. Lastly, the curse of Durvāsas must have been significant to the audience. That curse is symbolic, the tragedy is destined. The audience will sympathise with the heroine, an innocent victim of the cruel and infallible Destiny (me vacanam anyathā bhavitum nārhati ; my words could never be taken back, says Durvāsas).

The *viṣkambhaka* with such a significance for the development of the central theme may be compared with the *praveśakas* in these three plays. There are four *praveśakas* in all. (A. Śāk. VI, *Mālav.* III and V, and *Vik.* II).—In all these there is nothing that affects the progress of the main events ; no incidents are mentioned that would be important in their bearing on the plot. In some places the *praveśaka* is there for no other purpose except introducing the following main scene. In others, the *praveśaka* is nothing but a kind of a stage-shift in favour and for the convenience of the audience ; or it merely emphasises certain points of the incidents already represented. (cf. *Malav.* III).

It would appear from the foregoing as if some presumption is being logically worked out. The above examples have been discussed not because they bear out any presumption but that they reveal a genuine difference, from the early days, between the *viṣkambhaka* and the *praveśaka*. There might be, as there are, instances to the contrary. That in itself would prove nothing as the mere discussion so far would prove nothing by itself. There are many possibilities ; hence many considerations will have to be looked into. It is possible that soon enough circumstances that warranted the existence of such a difference between the *viṣkambhaka* and the *praveśaka* as explained above no longer existed, or it is possible that the dramatist himself would be an artist superior enough to rise above the tradition or inferior enough, not to utilise that tradition properly. As a matter of fact, even after Kālidāsa, some of the best Sanskrit plays do show this earlier difference between the *viṣkambhaka*—that serves the purpose of the stage convenience. The U. R. of *Bhavabhūti* is a good example. In all there are four *viṣkambhakas* in U.R., one each in Acts II, III, IV and VI. In all these four could be observed :

- (i) the situations newly introduced by the dramatist,
- (ii) the earlier situations themselves newly arranged or newly interpreted, and

- (iii) incidents that could not be represented on the stage but were all the same essential for the development of the central theme.

Thus in Act II the *viṣkambhaka* serves the purpose of not merely summarising the events during the 12 years' interval since Act I, but summarising only those that are relevant to the dramatist's purpose. Similarly in Act VI the *viṣkambhaka* describes an event which could not be represented on the stage, viz. the battle between Lava and Candraketu. In Act IV, the *viṣkambhaka* serves the purpose of letting the audience know the change of scene and the change of the atmosphere or the tone of the play. We are not any more in the *Daṇḍaka* forest lamenting with Rāma but have arrived at Vālmīki's hermitage where peace and happiness may be legitimately expected. In all these cases the arrangement of the incident is entirely the dramatist's invention. The most emphatic instance, in this respect, is Act III—the masterpiece of Bhavabhūti's art as acknowledged by many a good critic. Therein we have a situation so delicate and so celestial. To enjoy the grandeur, the nobility and the subtlety of the main scene, how successfully important is the *viṣkambhaka*? We learn from the *viṣkambhaka* that Rāma is coming to the *Pañcaviṭṭi*—a spot in the *Daṇḍaka* forest where he spent, for the last time, the happiest time of his life with his wife Sītā. (Note that in Act I only these memories are referred to.) Those memories would now oppress him worse because of his already dejected mental condition as described in Act II. To make things still worse, Sītā herself has been sent there; and what is artistically and effectively tragic, Sītā is not visible to any one except her friend Tamaśā. With this information the audience is in a mood to sympathise with the sorrow and to admire the nobility of both Rāma and Sītā. On the whole in this play the original significance of the *viṣkambhaka*, viz. (i) to narrate, and fill up the gaps in the important and relevant episodes, and (ii) to explain the equally important and relevant artistic innovations—this significance has been retained. As the scenes in which the various episodes are laid are too well known no characters are wasted—as in a *praveśaka*—in merely introducing the scene. It is *more than a mere accident that there are no praveśakas in the U.R.*

The other play of Bhavabhūti—the *MM*—has the same observations for a critic. The play is technically known as a *prakaraṇa* i.e. an incident from the common, human world dramatically represented. As in the *Mālav.* of Kālidāsa there is a *viṣkambhaka* in the

very first Act of MM. where not only the whole plot is summarised but all the characters, their positions and their mutual relations in the play are briefly narrated. Then there are three more *viṣkambhakas*—one each in Acts V, VI and IX. In all these three it is the novelty of the situations to follow that is depicted. The author has introduced some new artistic features as well as some other dramatic situations ; such original strokes are emphasised in the *viṣkambhakas*. Thus Acts V and IX are entirely new features ; the second is purely a lyrical or musical one abounding in descriptions of nature while the first stealthily introduces the crematorium in all its dreadful hideousness. It is only in Act VI that the *viṣkambhaka* describes the incidents in the interval. But the two incidents mentioned are such that (as in Act VI of the U. R.) they could not be represented on the stage ; the death of Aghoraghanta for a technical reason and the marriage procession for a practical difficulty. On the other hand the four *praveśakas* (Acts II, III, VII and VIII) serve the purpose of merely introducing the following main scene (Act III), or of describing the development of the sub-plot (Acts III and VII), or of first summarising the preceding events with reference to the relevant points therein (Act II). Thus the distinct nature of the *viṣkambhaka* and the *praveśaka* has been strictly maintained—the *viṣkambhaka* connected artistically with the central theme and the *praveśaka* connected practically with stage-convenience.

It is time now to turn back to the technical definitions of the *viṣkambhaka* and the *praveśaka* as given by the traditional authorities. From the passages quoted above, it will be seen that the *viṣkambhaka* and the *praveśaka* were distinguished even in those days. The grounds of distinction, however, appear to be superficial. Thus according to those definitions the difference between the two is threefold :

- (i) difference due to the status of the characters as *madhyama* and *nīca*,
- (ii) difference of the place in which each occurs as at the beginning of the first act or in between the subsequent acts, and
- (iii) difference where one suggests past and future events while the other narrates some unimportant events, (*śeṣārtha*).

None of these three reveals the whole truth. The first, as has been suggested above, was a mere accident of the early circumstances

where the plays were concerned with heroes and heroines, of an extraordinarily high status; the second loses much of its significance when in between two acts *viṣkambhakas* are found as free and frequent as *praveśakas*, while the last is doubtful for two reasons. (a) In some of the best plays are found *viṣkambhakas* whose point is not at all so much to narrate incidents past and future (*vyṛtta-* and *vartisyamāna*). In Act IX, for example, of Bhavabhūti's *MM*, is a *śuddha* i.e. unmixed *viṣkambhaka*. No relevant incidents past or future are summarised here. The following main scene is introduced in the first three or four sentences and the rest of the profuse *viṣkambhaka* is taken up by a description of nature. * (b) Secondly, the very interpretation of *śeṣārtha*, as given above, seems to be doubtful. Even as early as Viśwanātha of S. D. a confusion in this respect is noticeable. Viśwanātha who merely repeats the earlier rules has interpreted the phrase "*śeṣārtha*" in D. R. as "*śeṣam viṣkambhake yathā*; otherwise everything else as in the *viṣkambhaka*," which means that he recognises only the first two differences. Even in N. S. which should be the earliest of the three this same superficial distinction is recognised. (Cf. XX. 32-39). The *praveśaka* is a convenient summary of lengthy episodes (36) and the *viṣkambhaka* is similar (37). In the first the characters are of a lower status (33) while in the second they are of an intermediary status (37).

It should not be supposed that these treatises have entirely misunderstood the *viṣkambhaka* and the *praveśaka*. * From one point the formulation of these rules was fortunate in that they prevented once for all bad writers from writing good plays even by accident. Their rules are based on observations. Those observations might have been incomplete or superficial with the result that the deductions therefrom are incomplete and superficial. The chief reason is love for mere forms and lack of historical or scientific outlook. That the *viṣkambhaka* and the *praveśaka* originated with purposes different, as suggested by us, seems more reasonable if an equally reasonable history of the early development could be traced. In the early stages the *Sūtradhāra* recited or summarised the story at the very beginning. In some of the best plays the *viṣkambhaka* fulfils that function (cf. *Mālav. I* and *M. M. I*). Thus it appears that at some stage the *viṣkambhaka* replaces *Sūtradhāra* in one of the latter's traditional functions. All he had to do now, at the commencement of the play, was to introduce the poet and the play. The introduction of the

play was simple ; he would mention the name or the central theme of it. The introduction of the poet, however, must have been a complicated affair. Mere mention of the name would not carry weight or conviction. The poet had to be introduced not as an individual but as an artist. In other words, the artistic methods and measures of the dramatist had to be introduced and explained, if necessary. The Sūtradhāra as the manager of the show, was more responsible. He could not leave the stage after the formal *prastāvanā* ; we could imagine him waiting there to step out any and every time a new or clever artifice was employed by the dramatist. He would address the audience just before such a scene and explain the delicate situations that could not be understood merely by watching the course of events on the stage. Now and then he had to get up and summarise the incidents relevant to the story but not represented on the stage. Thus in the early days the Sūtradhāra himself must have been fulfilling the functions that later on are carried out by the *viṣkambhakas*. And this evolution of the *viṣkambhaka* from one of the early functions of the Sūtradhāra, might be responsible for the Sanskrit, and not the Prākṛt language, being regularly found therein. We could believe such an early situation not merely on the strength of inference but on actual observations in the modern folk representations—representations of the populace which are ever more honest, more enthusiastic and more conveniently situated to continue the tradition unbroken, unaffected and unmodified. It is probable that as the art of dramatic representation developed with regularity, the Sūtradhāra was distinguished in his two rôles, (i) when he appeared at the very beginning, and (ii) when he appeared during the interval. In the plays and situations discussed so far, the *viṣkambhaka*, more or less precisely, fulfils the second rôle with all its bearings.

In giving these examples we have not the least intention of conveying that plays in which the *viṣkambhaka* fulfils the supposed second function of the Sūtradhāra are earlier in age than those in which it does not. The only suggestion made is that such plays reveal a natural development of an earlier tendency. This circumstance might or might not be concerned with the relative priority of these plays. Śūdraka's *Mṛchh.*, for example, has neither *viṣkambhakas* nor *praveśakas*. Could it be reasonably said that the play, therefore, is one of the earliest? This absence of interludes might be due to the fact that the incidents of the story are so well knit

together in one continuous whole. Could it be said, on the other hand, that this very latter feature shows that the play is one of the later, if not the latest? In Viśākhaḍatta's M.R. there are two *praveśakas* in Act V and Act VI. The first differs from the second, introducing as it does a new situation wherein the *mudrā* or the signet plays the part of involving the Rākṣasa into one of the worst complications. In Act VI, the *praveśaka* simply summarises the events. In spite of this difference both are styled as *praveśakas*. Is it on a merely technical (superficial enough) ground viz. that the characters belong to a lower status and speak in *Prākṛt*, that the interlude to Act V is called a *praveśaka*—while it shows features of a genuine *viṣkambhaka*? Could we, because of this scrupulous observance of technicality, assign the play to a fairly later age? This, however, is not the time, nor is it the place, to attempt a definite answer to such questions.

One thing will have to be noted in this connection. With the exception of the plays of Bhavabhūti all other post-Kālidāsa plays show a confusion between the genuine *viṣkambhaka* and a *praveśaka*. The plays of Śrī-Harṣa (601-640 A.D.) are an illustration to the point. In *Rat* and *Nag*, together, there are two *viṣkambhakas* (*Rat*, I, *Nag*, IV). In the first the story of the play is introduced with the appropriate background. In *Nag*, Act IV, the *viṣkambhaka* has no point whatever. Nothing related to the past events is mentioned; the only practical use is to let the audience know that the following main scene is laid on the sea-shore (*samudra-velā*). In other words, the *viṣkambhaka* here serves the purpose that stage-equipment or curtain would serve in the modern plays and the *praveśaka* would serve in the older plays. In this function the *viṣkambhaka* and the *praveśaka* have been indiscriminately utilised by Śrī-Harṣa. (He has, however, recognised an apparent distinction according to the status of and the language spoken by the characters.) Thus the three *praveśakas* in *Rat*, II, III and IV, and the *praveśaka* in *Nāg*, I serve the same purpose of introducing the main scene to follow. Beyond that they have no other function in the play. Probably Śrī-Harṣa himself felt the pointlessness and monotony of such plays; for in *Nag*, he has initiated a new method of introducing the characters or the scene. As soon as the name of a character is mentioned in some connection in the dialogue, that character enters on to the stage. In Act I, for example, the heroine says that if she stands there talking to unknown men some hermit (*tāpasa*) might detect her. No sooner is the word

"tāpasa" mentioned than that character enters. Similarly, in Act II the heroine asks her friend if there is a remedy for her suffering. Her friend replies, "there is, if he (i.e. the hero) were to come here" and lo! the hero does come in before his name is mentioned. Again, in the same Act the female friend says that Mitrāvasu (the heroine's brother) might be expected any moment, and who should step in but the very Mitrāvasu referred to! The audience would, in this way, know the characters as well as the context. This only shows that the earlier *viṣkambhakas* and *praveśakas* had lost their original significance, had been confused and had deteriorated, to a dull type where the dialogue was so standardised as to be conventionally monotonous.

A last instance might be given to show the unpopularity and consequent decay of the *viṣkambhaka* and the *praveśaka*. In Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa's V. S. there is one *viṣkambhaka* (Act II) and one *praveśaka* (Act III). Both fulfil the same superficial function of summarising the incidents during the interval and of introducing the main scene to follow. The dramatist, when he created new situations or introduced incidents not represented on the stage, had to resort to newer methods. In Act IV the death of Karna's son is described though it is not so relevant to the central theme as to justify that lengthy description. In Act VI a new situation has been invented by the dramatist. But the way in which the *Cārvāka Rākṣasa* is introduced and made to carry on the mischief is not only tedious in itself but is also responsible for the subsequent stupid and meaningless developments in that Act.

The earliest *Sūtradhāra* who proudly and pompously introduced new situations was thus at last reduced, through the *viṣkambhaka*, to a superfluous character (or circumstance) that served as a machine talking in monotonous accents.

CHAPTER X

THE VIDUṢAKA

The discussion in the last chapter has carried us to a far later stage in the development of Sanskrit Drama. In connection with the *prastāvanā*, the various elements and characters related thereto have been described so far. There is, however, one more character which whether it is earlier or later, appears in the *prastāvanā* of some Sanskrit plays and which is mentioned in books on dramaturgy,¹ along with and as part of the definition of a *prastāvanā*. That character is the *Vidūṣaka* or the Brahmin court-fool. Is the *Vidūṣaka* in any way connected with the origin of Sanskrit Drama? What light does that character throw on the development of Sanskrit Drama? *Such and similar questions will have to be answered before an accurate and a complete picture of the Sanskrit Dramatic literature could be formed*

To start with, it would be better to meet the *Vidūṣaka* in the *plays themselves rather than in other places as books on dramaturgy* etc. The character of the *Vidūṣaka* seems to be one of the earliest. He could be met with even in the earliest known group of Sanskrit plays, viz., in that ascribed to Bhāsa. The *S. V.*, the *Avi.*, and the *Cār*—the three plays wherein the *Vidūṣaka* appears—can in another respect, be distinguished from the remaining ten of that group (with the probable exception of the *P. Y.*); the subject matter of these three is concerned with the life story of the traditional and mortal heroes of royal races. It has been already suggested that, from the very beginning, plays in Sanskrit dealt with the life-story of either kings or gods. It should be now noted in addition that the *Vidūṣaka* is found only in the luxurious company of princes. Wherever the hero is a mortal king, historical or traditional (history and tradition were not distinguished in those days) the *Vidūṣaka* appears on the stage. Is it a mere coincidence? Or was that character connected in any way to the nature of the hero and of the plot? *When, with the lapse of time, mythology too merged into tradition even mythological heroes like king Vikrama in the Vik. of Kālidāsa were provided with a*

1. D R III, 7-8; S D. 31-32.

Vidūṣaka. That the Vidūṣaka is a personal and an intimate friend of the hero-king is obvious even to a casual reader of Sanskrit plays ; that the Vidūṣaka is a court-fool is also made evident by some of the Sanskrit plays ; and that the Vidūṣaka is a confirmed Brahmin fool with physical as well as mental perversions is a tradition accepted by all the later Sanskrit dramatists.

How did such a character appear at all on the Sanskrit stage ? How was it that a Brahmin was represented in such a ludicrous light, especially during those early days when a Brahmin was highly respected through love and fear and habit ?

It has been referred to above that, by authorities on dramaturgy, the Vidūṣaka is mentioned in connection with the *prastāvanā*. The S. D. has these words :

naṭi vidūṣako vā'pi pāripārsvaka eva vā
sūtradhāreṇa sahitāḥ samlāpam yatra kurvate
ānukham tat tu vijñeyam nāmnā prastāvanāpi sâ

“The *prastāvanā* or the opening is that where the *naṭi* or the actor-friend or the Vidūṣaka appears in a dialogue with the Sūtradhāra.”

The *prastāvanā* as well as the Sūtradhāra have been shown to be the earliest features in the development of Sanskrit Drama. Can the Vidūṣaka also, mentioned in that connection, be an equally earlier feature ? Or can it be said that the S. D. being one of the latest treatises (the D. R. too belongs to the 9th or 10th century A.D.), has entirely misunderstood the significance and has been misled by the superficial features of the character of the Vidūṣaka ?

(i) It is true that the Vidūṣaka is the closest friend of the hero (who, except in the Cār. and the Mṛchh.) is invariably a king. In Bhāsa's S. V., a play belonging to the earliest group of known dramas, the Vidūṣaka is represented as having some of those traits which were later standardised. He refers to hunger and eatables. He is said to be a talkative person² which opinion is quite justified throughout the play. But Vasantaka, as he is called here, is not such a perverted fool as he is made to appear in some later plays. Nay ; on the contrary, he is not only a sincere friend but a close observer of human nature and quite a resourceful helpmate. There is, moreover, one function which is fulfilled by the Vidūṣaka, a function that

2. Also cf. Rat. I., A. Śāk. II., Mālav. III., Mṛchh. VI., etc.

could not be fulfilled by any other character, and hence which could be said to be the purpose and the peculiarity of his. He is the only character, who helps to introduce the hero, who serves as a foil to the latter and who is the only medium between the hero and the other characters on the one hand and between the hero and the audience on the other. One might even go to the length of saying that in all such plays the hero is introduced in all his relevant personality by the Vidūṣaka and the Vidūṣaka alone. He introduces not only the character but the scene and the situation as well. The audience is amused and instructed when the Vidūṣaka describes, in homely and humorous phrases, the scene laid. In most of the Sanskrit plays, whether earlier or later, the Vidūṣaka is utilised to give the description of the particular scene, surroundings and time. Thus in S. V. IV, Vasantaka describes the sights of the garden.³ *The Vidūṣaka always speaks in the Prākṛt dialect*, let us remember.

(ii) The Vidūṣaka appears to be a man of wide experience and keen observation. He is made responsible for some of the best sayings. It is a speciality with him to summarise, in pithy phrases, social experience and outlook. Strangely enough, in his early days he is one of those shrewd men who know what to say and when and where. Thus in the Mṛchh. III he protests that he is not such a fool as not to know when and where to joke (yathā nāma aham mūrkhah tat kim parihāsasya api deśakālam na jānāmi). When a right thing is done in a right way, the Vidūṣaka is not slow to appreciate it. In the S. V. he compliments the King on his proposed visit to Padmāvatī as that lady is suffering from headache. "Behaviour begets behaviour" is his word of wisdom. (Satkāro hi nāma satkāreṇa pratiṣṭaḥ prītim utpādayati). Similarly, in his usual homely allusions could be seen his keen power of observation. That the Vidūṣaka was keen and clever is borne out by some of the later classical plays which retain this trait of his. Thus, however different the three Vidūṣakas in the three plays of Kālidāsa might be, all of them are men of experience and observation and could give utterance to simple and sensible truisms.⁴ The fact that the Vidūṣaka is a Brahmin partly explains and is partly explained by this feature. A Brahmin was then generally respected as the repository of knowledge and experience; and a Brahmin was the only one qualified to teach and

3. Also cf. Rat. I, A. Śāk. II, Mālav. III, Mṛchh. VI, etc.

4. For a further analysis of Kālidāsa's Vidūṣaka, see Chapter XIII.

criticise. In a Brahmin Vidūṣaka therefore any statement would both be understandable and justifiable. Instances might be multiplied to show how the Vidūṣaka *and the Vidūṣaka alone* is made the mouth-piece of common-sense truths. The following would give an idea of Kālidāsa's Vidūṣaka.

- (i) lotreṇa gṛh̥tasya kumbhīlakasya asti vā prativacanam—
What could a thief caught red-handed say? (Vik. II)
- (ii) prāvṛṇ-ṇadī iva a-prasannā gatā devī—The Queen is as
disturbing (i.e. enraged) as a river in rainy season.
(Vik. II)
- (iii) chinna-hasto matsye palāyite nirvṛṇo dhūvaro bhanati
dharma me bhaviṣyati iti—The dejected fisherman, when
the fish escapes him, might say he has done a merito-
rious deed, in not killing it. (Vik. III)
- (iv) alam atra gṛh̥ṇayā aparādhū śāsanīyaḥ—Show no mercy.
An offender must be punished. (Vik. V)
- (v) kadāpi satpuruṣaḥ śoka-vaktavyā na bhavanti, nanu
pravāte pi nīkampā girayaḥ—Good (or great) men
never give way to sorrow. Mountains do not tremble
even in storms. (A. Śāk. VI)
- (vi) paṇḍita-paritoṣa-pratyāyā nanu mūḍhā jātiḥ—It is the
fools that are always goaded by the approbation of the
learned. (Mālav. II)
- (vii) na khalu mātā-pitarau bhartṛviyogaduḥkhitām duhitaram
draṣṭum pārāyataḥ—No parents could ever stand the
miserable plight of their daughter separated from her
husband. (ibid).
- (viii) daridra ātura iva vaidyena upanīyamānam auśadham
ichhasi—You are like a poor patient who longs for a
doctor's medicine. (Mālav. II)

(iii) The Vidūṣaka is not merely an experienced man but his experience is cast in a typically Hindu outlook. He is a confirmed fatalist. It is probable that he is usually called a "Vaidheya"—which means not so much a fool as a firm believer in "Vidhi" or fate. The half-pathetic and the half-comic situations and sentiments of his reveal "a man that Fortune's buffets and rewards hath taken" with no thanks. How piteously he complains in the Mṛchh. that every-

thing goes wrong with him ! (mama punar brāhmaṇasya sarvaṃ eva viparītaṃ pariṇamati). Neither in the S. V. nor in the A. Śāk. do we find the Vidūṣaka on the stage to witness the happy reunion of the hero and the heroine. It is quite characteristic of him to be the unwilling victim of both pain and pleasure. What wonder then if he were to believe that against the freaks of fate a human being is helpless? "Who can challenge Fate? Everything is so and so, i.e. as destined" (anati-kramariyo hi vidhiḥ idṛśam idānim etat) are his words of consolation to the king in the S. V. Similarly in the A. Śāk. VI, he consoles King Duṣyanta saying that Fate is ever powerful (bhaviṣyatyā khalu balavati). This feeling of helplessness and this fatalistic outlook of the Vidūṣaka could be instructively compared with the unrealistic ravings and bragging of the hero—as he is usually found to be doing in most plays.

(iv) The fore-going is sufficient to show that the Vidūṣaka is an experienced Brahmin of a fatalistic and resourceful nature. How or why is it that the Vidūṣaka is always supposed to be, and in later Sanskrit plays is always represented as, a fool? Why was a traditionally cultured Brahmin required to play a cultivated fool? How did a Brahmin come to be a Vidūṣaka and how did a Vidūṣaka turn into a perverted fool? These are the questions to be considered before a correct understanding of that character could be had.

Why was a Brahmin, in the first place, introduced as the Vidūṣaka? The answer to this question has been already suggested above. The character of the hero was invariably too exalted from the point of view of social status and besides, the hero as he is represented in almost all the Sanskrit plays is "His Amorousness" first and "His Highness or Majesty" next. In all these plays, moreover, it is the private life and leanings of the hero that are to be represented. Would such a royal hero condescend to talk of his love affairs to the ordinary characters introduced on the stage? Could the ministers and the menials and the maid-servants be deemed qualified to talk openly with or about the hero in his love affairs? True, the heroine is the fittest person in this respect. But she is too shy and too noble to talk freely with or about the hero. Moreover she is the end and not the means of the development of the love-story. Who but a Brahmin, then, could be more suitable to carry out this responsibility? By birth he belongs to the highest caste; by his caste, he has distinctive

privileges and immunities. This sense of immunity helps to bring out the characters and the situation in bolder relief. The Brahmin Vidūṣaka would be a friend of a status sufficiently high for the king and would also justify the confidence placed in him. Thus in the earliest plays, we would imagine the character of a Brahmin introduced. This character must have served the purpose of painting the hero in contrast to as well as in some life like aspects. This is the reason why the Vidūṣaka, in all Sanskrit plays, speaks in a Prākṛt dialect. He interprets the cultured and the cultivated sentiments of the hero to the populace.

For the functions he had to perform, it was not necessary that the Vidūṣaka should be either learned or pedantic. Oftentimes, as in the *Avi. II* of *Bhāsa*, he is called an *avaidika* (i.e. a heterodox fellow); he quotes the epic *Rāmāyaṇa* as a *nāṭyaśāstra* (a book on dramaturgy) and he compares himself to an uncultured prostitute (*prākṛta-gaṇikā*). The various names of his in the different plays are in themselves evidence to show that he made no claims to traditional or cultural learnings. Such names as *Vasantaka*, *Mādhavya*, *Mānavaka*, *Maitreya*, etc. have no association with the prominent names in the history of Brahmanic culture and learning. In the plays, too, the responsibilities of the Vidūṣaka were not directed either at holy purposes and functions or at any communication with the higher worlds. What was needed of him was more of common sense, and paradoxical as it might seem, the Vidūṣaka had a fund of common-sense. Moreover, for the chief and lively purpose of helping his hero-friend in his love-affairs, the Vidūṣaka had to be a man loving intrigue and scandal. As a Brahmin he had an inborn capacity for intrigue and scandal. As a member of the highest caste he could poke his nose into any affair and he could talk with an irresponsible laxity. It was this capacity for intrigue and scandal that probably earned for him the name "Vidūṣaka" meaning "a scandal-monger" (lit. one who spoils or disfigures). Thus in *Mālav. I.*, the king speaks of his friend Vidūṣaka as a *kāryāntara-saciva*, i.e. a counsellor in a different sort of affairs. Similarly in the same play the younger queen refers to the Vidūṣaka as *Kāmatantra-saciva*, i.e. a counsellor in love-affairs (IV).

We can now see as to how or why the Vidūṣaka deteriorated into a classical fool. The nature of the responsibilities he had to carry out brought him into closer and closer contact with the female

world, high and low, in the play. From the plays of Bhāsa to those of Śrī Harṣa the Vidūṣaka moves in the world of the harem and the maid-servants. It is in these circumstances and not when he is with the king that the Vidūṣaka plays the fool. He had to be amusing if he had to achieve his purpose. Being a clever man, he knows his jokes with the maids and the menials, as well as with the hero and the heroine. It is the increasing association of the Vidūṣaka with the menials of the harem that is responsible for conveniently turning him into a fool. Stupidity is the price paid by the Vidūṣaka to gain access into the world of the heroine and her associates. One must be a deserving hero or a harmless fool to seek the company and the confidence of the beauties of the harem.

There is yet another feature that might explain why the Vidūṣaka had to be a fool. It has long been the tendency of dramatists to represent their hero as a successful adventurer against innumerable odds. To be a hero one has not only to meet but plunge into dangers; nay, the greater the number of dangers the nobler hero one would be. Naturally all sorts of dangers and complications were placed in a hero's path. Some playwrights after Bhāsa utilised the Vidūṣaka in creating such complications. In adding to the complications the Vidūṣaka was only carrying out his original responsibility of showing the hero in noblest colours. The complications created by him, an unfortunate pessimist and fatalist as he was, could be expected to be unfortunate, ill-placed and hence comic. It was only a question of time that a Vidūṣaka who created such unfortunate situations should be called a fool. Thus in the Vik. II he commits the folly of letting out the secret of King Vikrama's love for Urvaśī. In the Mālav. IV he talks aloud in his sleep and lets a similar secret out. In Rat. of course, he is made to commit series of systematic and stereotyped follies. It is, however, only in some of the later plays like those of King Harṣa that the Vidūṣaka is the *traditional perfect fool*. Once he became that he ceased to be of any significance in a play. If the Vidūṣaka is to be a perfect fool from the very beginning how could he serve as a medium between the hero and the audience, or between the hero and the heroine? How could he be expected to raise laughter by his semi-cynical generalisations and his fresh and ill-placed sallies? How could he interpret the finer sentiments in popular language? He could do none of these. Humiliated, worn out and superfluous he became a sort of a laughing stock for the audience with his nose crooked, his limbs

deformed and his jokes stale. He lost his position and possibilities, his power and his freshness. Even before the play began we could know what he was going to say. He had grown too old to say anything new.

* * *

To complete the story of the Vidūṣaka, reference will have to be made to his successors. The original Vidūṣaka died out. The purpose, however, for which he was originally required in a play remained. This want was filled by some later dramatists of power and originality by creating other characters. It is, however, to the credit of the Vidūṣaka that no single character could replace him. Nowhere else could be found that combination of the smiles and the sorrows, of the fun and the freaks of life. In the MM. of Bhavabhūti, the character of Kāmandakī is akin to the earlier Vidūṣaka. Like him, she brings the different traits of the hero and the heroine to the notice of the audience, she introduces comic situations and she is a respectable lady of keen observation and wide experience. There was, however, no time for experimenting any further. Sanskrit, as a language, had died out long before Bhavabhūti. Soon after Sanskrit ceased to be even a fashion.

* * *

The Vidūṣaka could thus be said to have been introduced in Sanskrit Drama from the early days. The very nature of the plot and of the hero required that he, the Vidūṣaka, should be a Brahmin busybody, moving in aristocratic circles, where scandal and intrigue are usually rife. With the gradual change in life and manners he was first stereotyped and then taken to pieces where all the active elements were reduced to dull technicalities. In the evolution of Sanskrit Drama itself the character of the Vidūṣaka had a place and a function. By the side of the hero, the Vidūṣaka is both the Sūtra-dhāra and the Naṭī. He introduces the story and amuses the audience. Like the viṣkambhaka and the praveśaka, he serves the purpose of informing the audience of the incidents mainly connected with the hero and supposed to have happened during the interval.⁵ In this respect, he recalls to our mind the chorus of the Greek plays. The Vidūṣaka has stronger affinities to the chorus than has the

5. Cf. A. Śāk. Opening of Act II.

prastāvanā or the Sūt'adhāra. He is the only character who offers the dramatists a most convenient, powerful, and happy chance to moralize. So did the Greek chorus. Above all, it (the chorus) "gave the poet an opportunity of commenting and moralizing upon the progress of the events in the play proper." It should be added that the Vidūṣaka, alone in the dramatic world, could boast of "commenting and moralizing on the progress of the events" not only "in the play proper" but in life itself on the whole. Not merely does he instruct us from a height but he does interest and amuse us from our very midst

•
•



CHAPTER XI

EARLY PLAYS

(Bhāsa).

In the foregoing chapters we have described, with relevant details, some of the earliest features viz., the Sūtradhāra, the prastāvanā, the Vidūṣaka etc. in the development of Sanskrit Drama. We shall now turn to the study of some of the earliest plays themselves. The task here is more difficult. Chronology is the one stumbling block in the course of the history of Sanskrit literature. It is unfortunate indeed that a literature that can boast of great thinkers like the authors of the Upaniṣads, of great story-tellers like the authors of the two epics and of inspired poets like Kālidāsa—should leave in its trail no information at all as to the time and life of these accomplished writers. In spite of the honest and laborious research work of the Western as well as of the Eastern scholars we are still groping in the dark region of "probabilities." The meagreness of the material data, too, has been responsible, to an extent, for the mischief of fanciful imagination or of prejudiced dogmatism.

Nor is this all. Though we know nothing, for example, of the personal history of Kālidāsa, we are fortunate enough to know that he is the undisputed author of the great play—the *Abhijñāna Śākuntalam*; though we cannot say definitely when and where Pāṇini lived, we know this much for certain that there is no one else to challenge his authorship of the first systematic grammar of the world. These writers are fortunate indeed when compared to certain others who are sometimes denied even the credit of authorship.

One of such latter is the dramatist Bhāsa. That there was a dramatist named Bhāsa is undoubted. That he was a great dramatist is equally undoubted on the evidence of Kālidāsa's *Mālav*, mentioned already. From Bāṇa (7th century A.D.) and Rājaśekhara (11th Century A. D.) we know that Bhāsa was a well recognised dramatist. But it was only quite recently that Mahāmahopādhyāya T. Ganapati Sastri published, in the Trivendrum Sanskrit Series, some thirteen plays which he ascribed to Bhāsa. These plays should give us an idea of the early Sanskrit stage provided they are the works of Bhāsa referred to by Kālidāsa and others. Unfortunately Bhāsa's

authorship is not unchallenged. At present, there are three views on this question :

- (1) the one that insists that all the plays are the works of Bhāsa.
- (2) the second that insists as vigorously that none of the thirteen plays could be ascribed to Bhāsa and
- (3) the third that insists on not insisting either way, i.e. which believes in a careful and compromising study.

The Editor of the T. S. S. was an ardent advocate of the first view. In his introduction he has shown certain "peculiar" features as common to all the thirteen plays and has based his conclusion on these. The features referred to are as follows :—

- (a) All the plays open with the same stage direction—*nāndyante tataḥ pravṛṣaṭi sūtradhārah* : "after the benedictory verse enter the Sūtradhāra."
- (b) The prologue, in all the thirteen plays, is called *Sthāpanā* and not *Prastāvanā*
- (c) Usually, in all the later classical Sanskrit plays the dramatist mentions in the prologue his name, fame etc. (cf. the plays of Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, Viśākhadatta, Śūdraka, Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa etc). But all these thirteen plays agree in the fact that there is, in the Prologues, no mention at all of the author etc.
- (d) The *bharata-vākya* ends everywhere with the prayer "May the mighty King rule over the whole earth" (*imām api mahim kṛtsnām rājasinhah praśāstu nah*).
- (e) A structural similarity obtains in some of the plays ; e.g. in the opening verse the names of the characters are interwoven, a figure of speech technically called the *mudrālaṅkāra*.
- (f) There are deviations from the rules of Bharata and Pāṇini.

It is not within the scope of the present work to discuss the above points and their implications. One thing is certain viz, the style of all these plays shows that they are essentially meant to be represented on the stage. The *nāndī* verse (see point (a) above) belongs more to the actors than to the author. It is part of the stage-worship by the actors. The opening verse of a play is the author's and hence it cannot be said to be a *nāndī*. In the case of

the opening verse, therefore, "the definition of a *nāndī* does not apply" says Viśwanātha. "So we find (in a play like the Vik.), that some older manuscripts read the first verse after the stage direction '*nāndyante*' i.e. after the *nāndī*."¹ It is only an illustration to show that the six features which the Mahāmahopādhyāya finds peculiar are either insignificant or not to be found in each and every play, nor are they usually to be found all in one and the same play.

On the other hand, there are some obvious grounds to believe that the authorship of these plays belongs to more than one person. In the first place, the S. V., the P. Y., the P. R., and the Prat. are the only plays that show all the six "peculiar" features described above. Secondly, these four plays can be distinguished from the remaining nine on the ground of the preponderating number of śloka verses in the former.² Thirdly, may be mentioned the fact viz., that characterisation in these two groups is of such a different nature as to warrant different authorship. The Prat. and the Abhi., for example, are both based on the Rāmāyaṇa story, and yet there is a significant difference in the two plays with reference to Rāma's character. In the Prat., Rāma is great because he is an ideal son, an ideal brother and an ideal husband. All his actions and thoughts are such as are within the sphere of mortal activity. In the Abhi., on the other hand, Rāma is God incarnate. In a number of places he is mentioned as such. In Act I Sugrīva addresses Rāma as "deva, —God!" (I-8); Rāma is Śrīdhara; he is the Lord Madhusūdana himself, irrespective of anachronism (*prabhur vā madhusūdanah* I-32); he is the Lord of the Universe (*bhuvanaikanātha* III-21), Lord of men (*nṛdeva*, III-27), Lord- (*deva*, IV, 13-14) *Puruṣottama* (VI, 27-28) and finally he is completely identified with Viṣṇu (*viṣṇur bhavān*, VI 30-31). Likewise a contrast could be observed between the P.R. on the one hand and the M.V., the D.V., the D.G., the K.B., and U.B. on the other. (All these six are based on the Mahābhārata episode). Kṛṣṇa is a divinity *par excellence* in the last five plays. In the D. V. he is identified with Viṣṇu and

1. *evam ādiṣu nāndī-lakṣaṇāyogat. ata eva prāktana-pustakeṣu "nāndyante sūtradhārah" ityanantaram eva "vedānteṣu" ityādi śloka-lekhanam dṛṣyate.* (S. D. p. 28).

2. For a further analysis of these plays see the present writer's contributions to the Indian Antiquary, Vol. LX, 1931 pp. 41-45 and the Bulletin of the Sanskrit Literary Association, Karnatak College, Dharwar for the year 1930-31.

the four divine weapons, personified, are introduced on the stage. In the D'G, Kṛṣṇa is Lord Nārāyaṇa. In the U.B., Duryodhana of all—he who had thousand and one grievances against Kṛṣṇa—declares. in his dying breath that in being killed by Kṛṣṇa he was killed by “Hari, the beloved (Lord) of the World” (*jagataḥ priyera hariṇā* 35). The Bāl. is full of miracles from the very beginning. Lastly may be mentioned an important technical difference between the two groups. The Prologue is called *Sthāpanā* in the four plays of the first group. Of the second group the K. B. has the words ‘*iti prastāvanā*’ instead of ‘*iti sthāpanā*’; the D. G., in the opening verse, uses the word “*prastāvanā*” in connection with a *nāṭaka* and the *Sūtradhāra*. “May the Lord who is the *sūtradhāra* that introduces and develops the eternal drama of the three worlds protect us.”³ From such references would it be too much to infer that the two groups are not only not the works of one and the same author but that they belong to two entirely different times, the first group being earlier and the second (wherein are to be found elements like the *prastāvanā*, the deification etc.) later? It was shown above how the *Sūtradhāra* was the earliest and the *prastāvanā* a later technical element in the development of Sanskrit Drama. In that case, we can reasonably believe that the four plays of the first group belong to a period much earlier than that of the remaining nine. Though, among the thirteen plays, we find some earlier and some later, we can reasonably believe that all the thirteen belong to the earliest period in the history of Sanskrit Drama. (Those attributed to Aśvaghoṣa might be earlier still, but as they are not available except in fragments, they do not much affect the present statement.) It is for this reason that we find among the thirteen plays certain deviations from the rules of both Pāṇini and Bharata. The N. S is an elaborate treatise, which presumes a sufficiently developed stage. It would be unreasonable, therefore, to expect the earliest plays to accord with the rules of later treatises!

There is another circumstance which speaks of the antiquity of the plays under consideration; it is the style and the treatment. In none of these plays do we find a highly artistic development. It is, as in the case of the epics, the story of narration that is more interesting than the art of narration. Nay, the fact that most of the

3. *loka-trayā-virata-nāṭaka-vastu-tantra-prastāvana pratisamāpana-sūtradhārah.*

plays treat of the epic episodes would tempt one to believe that these plays drew inspiration directly from the epics. The popularity of the employment of the epic metre strengthens still more such a belief. We have seen already how Sanskrit Drama owes its origin to the epic recitation. In the face of such circumstances would it not be reasonable to hold that these plays, based so essentially as they are on the epic style and subject-matter, represent, almost certainly, the earliest stage of Sanskrit Drama? Even those deviations from the rules of Pāṇini, could then be reasonably understandable—since the plays must have been written in the popular style of the epics. It is interesting to note in this connection that in the K. B. one MS. reads *kavacāṅkam samāptam* (thus ends the Armour Act) instead of *karma-bhāram avasitam* (thus ends the play *karma-bhāra*). Similarly, three out of the five MSS. of the Abhi. read *Śrī rāmāyaṇam samāptam* (thus ends the holy Rāmāyaṇa) instead of *abhiṣekanāṭakam samāptam* (thus ends the play *Abhiṣeka*). All these facts justify one to conclude that there must have been an attempt to dramatize the epic episodes. Similar attempts might have been made with the Rāmāyaṇa, though we have only the Prat. and the Abhi. (which, be it noted, cover between themselves the whole Rāma story.)⁴ Such a tendency is easily understandable. From the very beginning the epics had attained an unparalleled popularity. Even in modern India the recitation of the two epics is carried on with sanctimonious regularity. If we bear in mind that the form of narration in the epics, especially in the Mbh., is predominantly that of dialogues, we should not be surprised at the attempts to dramatize the episodes therein. The task was not only tempting and inspiring but an easy one. The earliest dramas are thus merely the first attempts of the Sūta to popularise the epics by representing their themes on the stage. It is somewhat interesting to note that a legend speaks of Bhāsa as a dhāvaka i.e. a man of lower social status. Bhāsa might not have been an actual sūta of the epic traditions but he might have been of a sufficiently low origin, and further, sufficiently qualified to continue the sūta-tradition of popularising the epics. Unless we take these plays as the earliest attempts in this direction, we cannot satisfactorily explain defects in technique like

4. The story of Rāma is to be found even in the Mahābhārata (III). As a matter of fact the Abhi. ending with the coronation of Rāma, covers the entire story as narrated in the Mbh. The abandonment of Sītā etc. are not to be found in the Rāma story of the Mbh.

disregard of time or place side by side with poetry of a high quality. Drama as such was still in its infancy. We find herein more of the epic style of narration than that of artistic arrangement. (In plays like the M. V., the D. G., the U. B., the Bāl etc. there are fights on the stage which are half-artistic. In the Bāl. (III) we have a reference to dance (*hallīśaka*) and music (*ātodya*). In the same play (V) there is boxing of Cāṇūra and Muṣṭika. In the U. B. (9) we read :

cārīm gatim pracarati praharatyabhūkṣṇam
samsīkṣite narapatir balavānstu bhīmah

"The King (i.e. Duryodhana) is graceful in his steps and quicker on the weapon ; he is a trained fighter ; but Bhīma has more of physical strength."

The words *cārī* (a dance-step) and *samsīkṣita* (trained) show that dancing, as an art, had found a place in dramatic representation. Bharata is not so unreasonable when he says that the first performance was a *samavakāra* representing the fight of the Gods with the demons. The brilliant device of introducing dance on the stage as in Kālidāsa's *Māl* has here its crude beginnings.)

CHAPTER XII

MAIN TENDENCIES

(A) *Social Conditions.*

In the last chapter an attempt was made to show that the thirteen plays ascribed to Bhāsa belonged to the earliest period in the history of Sanskrit dramatic literature. Whether all thirteen are, or are not, written by Bhāsa, is immaterial for the present purpose viz., to find out the relation of these plays to contemporary social life. Since no one date is, universally or with certainty, accepted, it is better to view the question from another point of view i.e. to find out the social conditions as reflected in the thirteen plays.

Could we presume, in the first place, that a dramatist does necessarily represent contemporary social life and manners? Does he represent the world as it is or as he finds it or as he would like to find it? Though it is difficult to answer these questions, it might be asserted, in the present context, that a good dramatist could not avoid depicting the tendencies, if not the tangibilities, of his times. It is more in the details and development than in the plot or presentation proper that one could reasonably detect the social and cultural background of the dramatist.

From such a point of view, the society represented in these thirteen plays seems to be comparatively a primitive one. The conception of society as such, as we have it now, is still not to be found. It is the family, the group of blood-relationship that is recognised in a sort of social aspect. Family, forming the one group of co-operation, is idealised. The sanctity and the claims and the traditions of the family come above all. Each and every member of the family owes allegiance to the family. It is his bounden duty to respect and preserve the family traditions. The thirteen plays under discussion are scrupulous and unanimous in this respect. In the P. R., for example, a family is said to be ruined even if an individual member misbehaves. "A man with no character burns away his family" (I-12): "Members of a family will have to run away if one of them loses character" (I-12). In the Prat., when Rāma, the legitimate heir to the throne, is duly crowned his brother Śatrughna says "By this coronation of my elder brother, the stain on our family is

wiped out" (VII-13). Similarly, in the *Abhi.* Vāli, the monkey-chief, entreats from his death-bed that his brother Sugrīva should continue the good traditions of his family.

vimucya roṣam paṇḍhya dharmam
kula-pravālam paṇḍhyatām naḥ¹

"Give up your anger and take up, according to Dharma, our family traditions."

In the same play, Sītā prays that her husband be victorious if she has never violated the high family traditions².

With this attitude towards the family it is no surprise if blood-relationship is held in high sanctity. Members of a family are always believed to be identical not only in conduct and character but even in the details of their physical features. Instances, even at random, might be multiplied. Remarks like *aho svara-sādṛśyam—aho rūpa-sādṛśyam*—Oh! what a resemblance of voice! of form and figure! etc. are strewn over. Oftentimes they seem quite far-fetched and ridiculous. Thus in the *Prat.* (IV) Sītā goes forward to meet Bharata; but the resemblance between the brothers Rāma and Bharata is so close that she mistakes the latter for her husband! In the *MV*, the voice of Ghaṭotkaca misleads Bhīma who takes him for one of Arjuna's sons (since the children of two brothers would belong to the same generation) while Ghaṭotkaca is the son of Bhīma himself. Blood is so important that it could determine, on its own strength, even the character of an individual. For this reason the queen in the *Avi.* is surprised that a heroic youth, who rescues her daughter, should be an *antyaja*—a low caste fellow.³

Family was thus the recognised social unit. This fact is significant in another respect. It helped to determine the place of a woman in a society. A woman from her very birth, was a problem. "A father of a daughter to be married has enough to worry about" says the king in the *Avi.* (I). A woman, too, could destroy a family by her misconduct. A woman's faults cost the good name of a family. "By the fault of a woman a good man, in a bad family,

1. *Abhi.* I-26.

2. *Īkṣvākuḥ, ātmanah kula-sadṛśena cāntreṇa yadi aham anuśarāmi ārya-putram, āryaputrasya vijayo bhavatu* (*Abhi.* V).

3. *akulinah katham evam sāmukrośo bhavet. How could a low-born man be so sympathetic?* *Avi.* I.

is destroyed" (*niviṣṭe duṣkule sādhuḥ strīdoṣeneva dahyate*, (P.R. I-14). A woman's capacity to destroy was greater than that of a man. In her life-time a woman would be a member of two families—that of her parents in the beginning and that of her husband later. The King in the *Avi.* says as much : *kuladvayam hanti madena nāri*, "A woman, by her bad behaviour, destroys two families" (I-3). As for the girl herself, the time before marriage was happier than that afterwards. For this reason, the female-friend in the *S. V.* tells *Padmāvati* to enjoy before she is given away in marriage. (*nirvartatām tāvad ayam kanyābhāvaramanīyaḥ kālaḥ*, I.). Once married, the girl became merely the property of her husband. In the *Prat. Lakṣmaṇa* does not attempt to dissuade *Sītā* from following her husband to the forest. Why should he? "A wife is her husband's property" (*bhartṛ-nāthā hi nāryaḥ*, *Prat.* I-25). In addition to this general privilege of being treated as a chattel, a woman of aristocratic traditions enjoyed the right to live a sequestered or *purdah* (*avagunṭhana*, *Prat.* I) life.

The married woman, however, was compensated in some ways for this loss of human rights. Within the four walls of a family she wielded authority and commanded high respect as a mother. Even *Ghaṭotkaca*, a being of *Rākṣasa* traditions, speaks highly of a mother's position.

mātā hi manuṣyāṇām daivatānām ca daivatam

"A mother is a deity indeed to men as well as to gods" (*M.V.* 37).

The chief characters in all these plays are more usually addressed under a maternal appellation. Thus *Rāma*, *Lakṣmaṇa* and *Bharata* are addressed as *kausalyāmātāḥ* (one whose mother is *Kausalyā*), *sumitrā-mātāḥ*, and *kaikēyī-mātāḥ* respectively; *Duryodhana* is *gāndhārī-mātāḥ*, *Kamsa* and *Vasudeva* address each other (*Bal.*) as *śaurasenī-mātāḥ* and *yādavī-mātāḥ* respectively. Where a married woman enjoyed such honourable position there was no place for some early and less refined practices like the *niyoga*—the "levirate" system. *Rāma*, in the *Abhi.*, accuses *Vālī* of unlawfully living with his own younger brother's wife. "Never should an elder brother live with his younger brother's wife" (*na tveva hi kadācit jyeṣṭhasya yavīyaso dārābhimarśanam*—I).

The only other social unit, bigger than the family and closely knit on the same ties as blood-relationship and heredity was the

caste. The Brahmuns and the Kṣatriyas are referred to as the higher and the more important classes. The Brahmin, however, has an undecided superiority over all others. In the P.R., the universally respected Bhīṣma himself says that Droṇa is superior since "you (i.e. Droṇa) are a Brahmin and I a Kṣatriya." (*dvijo bhavān kṣatriya-vamśajā vayam P.R. I-27*). Even Karna in the K.B. says that he would never go against a Brahmin (*brāhmaṇa-vacanam iti na mayā atikrānta-pūrvam*). Circumstances too are such as to justify a Brahmin's superiority. Sacrifices must have been still in vogue as it would appear from the enthusiasm and the elaborateness in which they are described at the opening of the P. R. People believed in the efficacy of the Vedic rites.⁴ In every way the customs, conventions and superstitions in vogue speak of a well-established priesthood. Oftentimes the very plot of a play is highly illustrative in this respect. The story in the S.V. and in the P.Y. is possible only because the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa believes in the fortune telling of a Siddha. Similarly, Kaikeyī in the Prat. takes upon herself the unpleasant task of sending Rāma and others into exile in order that a sage's curse may not be falsified. Her own words (VI) are definite; *apariharāṇīyo maharṣiśāpāḥ putra-vipravāsam vinā na bhavati*. "The curse of a sage could not be averted, nor was it possible (to minimise its dangerous results) except by sending the son into exile." In such a society of customs and conventions and ritualism a Brahmin was expected to be well-versed in so many lores. Thus, Rāvaṇa, disguised as a Brahmin in the Prat. mentions the various lores he knows, Manu's Code of Law, Māheśwara Yoga, the Politics of Bṛhaspati, the Nyāya of Medhātithi, and the Prācetasas rules in ritualism (*śrāddha-kalpa*). Teaching centres, too, must have existed. In the S.V. I, the śiṣya mentions Lāvāṇaka in the *Valsa* country as a centre of education.

The life of the Kṣatriyas, on the other hand, seems to have been a hard one. From the S.V. and the Avi. one could easily see that the country was divided into a number of petty principalities. A Kṣatriya was brought up in a martial atmosphere. To fight was his one creed in life. It was either to die or kill on the battlefield but never to be defeated. Thus the old king Virāṭa in the P.R. says that

4. Cf. *hutam ca dattam ca tathaiva tiṣṭhati* "Whatever is offered in a sacrifice or is given in charity lasts eternally, i.e. brings eternal bliss" (K. B. 22).

he would acquire fame if he dies or in case he releases the cows from the enemies he would acquire merit. (*nidhanam api yaśas syāt mokṣayitvā to dharmah*—P.R. II, 5). Similarly, the boy Abhimanyu says that a hero must either die or conquer on the battlefield (*avaśyam yudhi virāṇam vadho vā vijayo 'tha vā*—P.R. III, 5).

Political life under such circumstances cannot but be very unsettled. A Kṣatriya prospered according to his power. So, as in the S.V. and the Āvi., we always find a king quarrelling with his neighbour. A Kṣatriya's career was in his weapons. (*bhāṇādhīnā kṣatriyā-nām pravṛddhiḥ*—P.R. I, 24). Any adventurer could carve out a kingdom for himself. No wonder that Duryodhana ridicules the Pāṇḍavas when the latter negotiate for a share in the kingdom.

*rājyam nāma nrpātma-jaiḥ saḥdayair jītvā ripūm bhuḥjyate
tal loke na tu yācyate na tu punar dīnāya va' dīyate*
(D.V. 24).

"Princes should conquer their enemies and then rule and enjoy a kingdom. Nobody ever begs for a kingdom nor does any one give it in charity."

Even after conquering, it was not so easy to maintain it. Each and every prince was waiting to grab it at the earliest opportunity. So, in the Prat, Rāma advises his brother Bharata not to neglect the kingdom for a moment. (*rājyam nāma muhūrtam api na upekṣaṇīyam*. Prat. IV). Conspiracies might be hatched within the very walls of the palace. So even Sītā, is slightly cynical when she hints that intrigues reign in palaces (*bahu-vṛttāntāni rājakulāni rāma*. Prat. I); justice, popularity, leniency etc. are more in the diplomacy than in the doctrines of the day. It is difficult to see the motive of the old king Virāṭa when he feels ashamed to levy taxes without offering protection in return. (*nīrlajjo mama ca karaḥ karāṇi bhuṅkte*, P.R. II, 3). The virtuous protection is so ill-placed. The freedom of style and the frequency of situations, in which fights are usually described in these plays, the way in which Vālī is killed on the stage (Abhi. I) or that in which Kariṣa dashes, presumably on the stage, a baby against a rock (Bal. I)—all this shows the roughness of the path that led to the throne.

The unsettled political conditions are further reflected in the bias against town-life. The plays rarely let go a chance of showing disgust towards the turbidity and the turbulence of town-life. When people are being pushed away even in the forest with the roughness

of policemen Yaugandharāyaṇa exclaims—upayanam grāmīkaroti ājñayā. "Authority" (i.e. the use of it) is turning the forest precincts into a town" (S.V. I, 3). Similarly, the sight of dust and din is immediately associated with a town. (vanam idam nagarīkaroti—thus forest is changing into a city. Part. VII-4.)

In such a society it is a satisfaction to find that art has advocacy and appreciation. (Dancing is very frequently mentioned and introduced in the Bāl. Even when a fight is going on the spectators do not fail to notice the graceful steps of the fighters. Thus in the Abh., VI, 14 the Vidyādhara notices the fighters stepping a cārī (cārībhir etān parivartamānān). Music, too, held a high place. Queen Vāsavadattā in the S.V. is said to play on the vīṇā. In the Avi., too, the hero is a connoisseur of music (Act II). In the prologue to the Prat. the naṭī is called on the stage for no other purpose than singing.) Painting was another art which had worked up its place to the royal courts. Thus in the D.V. Duryodhana, is looking at the picture wherein the episode of Draupadī being dragged by hair is sketched. The words in which he describes the picture are sufficiently technical to show that painting was appreciated and cultivated as an art : aho asya varṇāḍhyatā aho asya bhāvāpannatā, aho yuktalekhatā "What a proper placing in the colour. How fittingly does it convey the feelings ! Oh, how proportionate are the lines and the perspective !" (Lastly, drama and staging are mentioned in connection with extraordinary or festive occasions (Thus at the time of Rāma's coronation, in Prat. I, the mails are making arrangements in the music hall (sangīta śālā). The actors (called nāṭakīya-s) have been asked to represent a play. What is still more interesting, the actors have been instructed to select such a play as would suit the occasion (kālasamvādinā nāṭakena). Would it be too much to believe that play-acting had reached a stage where it could meet the demands not only of the audience but of the occasion?)

• • •

(B) *Tendencies of the Early Drama.*

The history of social life sketched so far should, if it were known to us in some first-hand authoritative form, have been the background of our study. As it is, the intriguing situation arises of first reconstructing such a history from such a literary material and then studying those very literary models in the light of the history thus reconstructed. As Carlyle says, "In any measure to understand

the poetry, to estimate its worth and historical meaning, we ask, as a quite fundamental inquiry : what that situation was? Thus the History of a Nation's Poetry is the essence of its History, political, economic, scientific, religious." ⁵ Thus, with no desire to offer any further justification, it would be noted as the only method of an honest study.

In what relation do the thirteen plays, under question, stand to the society depicted above? How far do they represent the contemporary social tendencies? What place do they occupy in the history and development of drama as an art? These are some of the questions to be answered here. That the drama was recognised as a cultured entertainment for the rich and the poor alike is evident from Prat. I referred to above. (Singing and dancing had already been incorporated in the acted play.) There is only one thing which strikes even a casual reader of these plays. All the plays are prominent in betraying their inspiration mainly from tradition. The story of King Vatsa (the S.V. and the P.Y.) on one hand and those from the epics, on the other, go to prove that the avowed object of the dramatist is to sing the glories of the highest god and of the highest man of Vedic traditions. The cult of sacrifice is upheld and applauded (P. R. I). The gods of the heroic age—Rāma and Kṛṣṇa—are the subjects of devotion and description in the Prat., the Abhi. and the Bāl. The very godliness of the gods is that handed down by the epics. Of the two, Kṛṣṇa is a greater favourite since he is identified, more frequently than Rāma, with the highest God. It is Kṛṣṇa again to whom the divine miracles are attributed (Bāl.).

That the epics influenced these early plays to an essential extent is obvious not only from the stories but from the style in which they are depicted. Narration and description, as in the epics, still form the foremost feature. Features that distinguish drama from literary are in general not prominent yet. Construction and characterisation are still in a nascent stage. (Some scenes here and there have in them the making of dramatic art : e.g. (1) in the S.V. the King dreams about his first queen whom he believes to be dead but who as the audience knows, is still alive though disguised and is actually present on the stage ; (2) the way in which Bharata, in the Prat. comes to know of his father's death from the latter's carved figure in the House of the Dead ; or (3) the scene where Abhimanyu the

son of Arjuna, is brought face to face, in the P.R., with his father and uncles who are living incognito just then.) Such scenes, however, are not only rare, but are often introduced in crude abruptness and developed with no delicacy. Thus in the Prat. though the scene is dramatic, its very possibility is out of question. The time required to fetch Prince Bharata from the house of his maternal uncle is ridiculously short; but, in that short while, not only is King Daśaratha dead but his figure carved and placed in the House of the Dead (to top that, Bharata is aware of such a place for the first time!) It seems as if the roughness of the social life is reflected in the crudity of the plays. They are typical of the age in which they are written. They are virile, they are forceful, they move with speed and determination, but they lack that harmony and delicacy which alone could sustain the virility by making it attractive.

The social conditions seem, to some extent, to have checked the development of the art in one respect. The authors of all these plays are not only dramatists but teachers in morality. The lessons taught are, of course, elementary. It is that universal yet primitive sentiment which another great dramatist of another time was to express with due protests:

O thoughts of men, accurst

Past, and to come, seems best; things present worst.*

This fatalist outlook, an outlook more likely than any other to prove fatal to art, is to be discerned in all these plays. It is all the sadness and the wickedness of the world that are held before us as the curse of this life and the cause of the life destined to come. God has been represented throughout more as a punisher of the wicked than as a protector of the good. Even the historical hero—King Vatsa—moves in a world of the evil inevitable. The youthful and heroic prince Avimāraka is labouring under the curse of a sage as he steps on the stage. It is true that most of the plays end in a happy union or re-union of the hero with the heroine. That is only a superficial aspect and should not lead us blindly to believe that all these plays are comedies, much less to generalise that tragedy in art is unknown to Sanskrit drama. Who could be deaf to the eloquent pleading of all these plays on behalf of man helplessly fighting against fate? The Vidūṣaka in S.V. (Act IV) is a true representative of the age and of the dramatist

when he sadly sings the tune, *anatikramaṇīyō vidiḥ, īdṛśamidānīm etat*. "Fate is difficult to be overpowered; well, 'tis so and so;" that even the greatest should, and shall, suffer is a sentiment expressed with conviction and consistency. This sentiment is the very element of tragedy in drama. It is only the fervent faith of Hinduism that saves the hero from being placed, as the Shakespearean tragic hero is, in such circumstances that his fall is assured. The tragic element, however, is to be seen in the fact that the hero is placed high above all the characters before he is made to suffer. And here does the dramatist, assume the rôle of a teacher in morality. The wicked, of course, pay with life for their wickedness while good character in itself is no guarantee to any exemption from occasional or inevitable lapses.

(The five one-act plays based on the episodes of the *Mahābhārata* lend support for admitting such a conception of tragedy. D.V., D.G., and U.B. are plays where Duryodhana is the central figure. He is not, however, the mean-minded, self-centred, sinful demon, that he is in post-epic tradition. He is a true representative of the dramatist's age: arrogant, adventurous, consistently unscrupulous and brutally reasonable. Inevitable doom darkens round such a character as night that hovers slowly, phantom-like and fear-inspiring round the timid, and sinful hearts. The most noble Karna (in K.B.) is made a victim of his own nobility and all because he was chivalrous and sincere in siding with the wrong. This tragic element, as said above, was saved fateful conclusions because of faith on the one hand and of ignorance on the other.) The Hindu mind defied history by persisting in its belief of a happier life and a happier world to come. Present life and the earthly globe were presumed, at the very beginning, not to bring in any happiness. No hopes, no despairs; no desires, no achievements. The character of the *Vidūṣaka* is symbolic of this attitude. He is a man destined to eternal disillusionment—where happiness is concerned. The hero and the heroine may be united, but he himself is never destined even to be present on such occasions (cf. S.V., A. Śāk., Vik. etc.). In thus creating a symbol for its age and its expression the drama of Bhāsa's days could be said to have made the first advance towards art. The social surroundings were not as yet such as could ensure it a happy, rapid and healthy growth. Drama now was not so much a representation of man's life in the world as of man's position in the world. The dramatist desired not to construct the facts of life but to convey a sense of the forces in life.

CHAPTER XIII

KĀLIDĀSA

So far we have seen that the early Sanskrit plays (i) were more or less inspired by, and thus based on, the epics; (ii) were narrative in form and development; (iii) 'were staged in the open as the absence of stage-directions indicates and for the very audience to which the Sūta, in earlier days, recited the epics'; and (iv) that the authors of these plays were first moralists and then artists, if at all.) When we come to the next known period to be studied in this chapter, we notice a great change with respect to all these above four points.

If one were to speak on the evidence of plays available, one would say that from the first century B.C. or A.D. there was a complete blank. Is it possible that during these 300 years or so no dramatist was born or that Sanskrit drama was not at all encouraged? It is true that, as history tells us, the cultured ascendancy during this period belonged not to the Aryan society in the north but to the Andhras, etc. i.e. to the adventurers of the non-Aryan community in the south. In spite of these circumstances, however, it seems that Sanskrit literature, *was* encouraged; only, patronage now passed into the hands of the foreigners like the Scythians established in the west and of non-Aryan royal families like the Andhras etc. in the south. As has been suggested¹ already these foreigners, as the inscriptional evidence shows, extended whole-hearted patronage to Sanskrit literature and the Vedic traditions.

The evidence of the literary materials too leads to the same conclusion. The plays next available immediately after those studied so far are those of Kālidāsa. In the prologue to one of his plays he refers to earlier dramatists of whom only Bhāsa is known to us.² Secondly, the very excellence of Kālidāsa's plays presupposes many more earlier dramatists. Lastly, we have evidence in Kālidāsa (as will be seen below) which shows that drama had been developing and had actually developed by his time to such an extent as to deteriorate into a fixed, lifeless form. It was the genius of this great

1. Vide *infra*. Chap. VIII.

2. *prathita-yaśasīm Bhāsa saumilla kavīputrādīnām prabandhān atīkramya*, etc. (Mālav. Prologue)

dramatist that not only saved drama from degradation but raised it to an artistic source of joy—even at the risk of temporary (or contemporary unpopularity).³

Kālidāsa is the reputed author of three Sanskrit plays—the Vikramorvaśīyam, the Mālavikāgnimitram and the Abhijñāna Śākuntalam. The first and the last deal with stories from traditional mythology (purāṇa) and traditional history (itihāsa). The hero of the second mentioned play is King Agnimitra—the son of Puṣyamitra who, in the early part of the second century B.C. founded the Śunga dynasty.⁴ Thus it appears that even in Kālidāsa the same tendency, as in the early days, is to be found in singing of the glorious past. That, however, would be a hasty judgment. Kālidāsa, as could be seen from his plays, is first and foremost a student of art. In all his three plays singing, dancing, painting etc. are introduced in words and circumstances that reveal Kālidāsa as an expert connoisseur and critic. What is more to the point is his views on drama. To him drama is, not, as to the early writers, a popular method of preaching; drama, he says, is the study and not the moral of life. It is the varied scope of such a study that makes drama interesting to the various tastes of the public. Music, dance, painting etc. do not attract each and all while drama, combining in itself, all these and dealings with the ways of the world, claims a greater audience than does any other art. "Here", he says "is to be found the manifold ways of the world arising from the three qualities (i.e. the variety of tastes and talents); and hence, though varied in form and scope, drama is an entertainment common to people of different tastes"⁵

Under these circumstances one would be justified in expecting that Kālidāsa would work off the beaten track. Is such an expectation fulfilled in his three plays? It seems, on the whole, that Kālidāsa eventually effected a revolution in the world of letters. Though, from the point of view of their plots, the three plays seem to belong to the antiquated, standardised type dealing with love-stories of traditional kings, one could see that the development and the construc-

3. It is not the object of the present work to discuss the age of Kālidāsa; the sort of internal evidence elaborated in this chapter would strengthen the view that assigns Kālidāsa to the period of Samudra-Gupta or his son Chandra-Gupta II (373 A.D. to 415 A.D.).

4. Cf. C. H. I. Vol. I, p. 518.

5. traiguṇyodbhavam atra loka-caritam nānārasam drśyate, nāṭyam bhinnarucir janasya bahudhāpyekam samārāadhanam (Mālav. I-4).

tion them point to an entirely opposite conclusion. Nay, it seems that Kālidāsa deliberately selected the most popularly known stories so that he could divert all his skill towards their artistic construction. The audience already knew the story ; and imperceptibly and with no harm or disadvantage to the audience he left out the old narrative style.

It would be strange, indeed, if Kālidāsa achieved all this at one stroke or in his very first play. In the three plays we notice a gradual, progressive adjustment of his art and conception ; and we also notice the painful struggle of an original mind with that Universal Ego—the dull and deadening conservatism. The partiality of Kālidāsa to music and dancing is consistently pronounced. In his very first play⁶ he assigned a great part to music and dancing. The only novel path he struck first was in that respect ; but otherwise, his first play viz., the *Vikramorvaśīyam* is nearer to the standard type. The *Mālavikāgnimitram* is a further improvement on the *Vik.* For this reason, we are inclined to hold, against the more or less unanimous verdict of well-respected and authoritative scholars, that the *Vik.* and not the *Mālav.* is the first of Kālidāsa's plays. The poet in the *Vik.* is evidently younger than in the *Mālav.* The very manner in which he craves the indulgence of his audience speaks of a diffident voice. Of course, he says, it is my play ; but that is not at all the important point about it. "You should listen to it out of sympathy for the lovers, or out of respect for the noble characters therein. I beg of you to follow attentively this work of Kālidāsa."⁷ The *prastāvanā* or the prologue is modelled on earlier types as in the plays of Bhāsa. As soon as the *Sūtradhāra* introduces the play there is a cry for help behind the curtain and the *Sūtradhāra* then speaks in the same words as his predecessor in Bhāsa did. "What is this I hear? A cry for help. Did I not hear it immediately I requested my audience to—Oh, I know"⁸. The poet's construction of the plot is less skilful and his similes are more commonplace than elsewhere. The author here is more an enthusiastic young poet than a craftsman of art and ideas. The characters in the *Vik.* (e.g. the *Vidūṣaka*) are standardised as in earlier plays. Kālidāsa was not only a new arrival him-

6. *prapayīṣu vā dākṣiṇyāt athavā sadvāstu puruṣa-bahumānāt, śṛuṭa manobhīr avahutaib kriyām imām kālidāsaśya* (*Vik.* I-12).

7. *aye kim nu khalu mad vijāḥpanānantaram kurarīpā miva śikāṣe śabdah śrūyate bhavatu, jñātam* (*Vik.* Prologue).

self, but the first one of his time, in the field of drama. He says in the prologue that upto that time only plays of earlier dramatists were produced ; that his was the first of a modern, so to say. Why should he say that ? What harm is there, one would like to ask him, if earlier plays alone were staged ? No harm, Kālidāsa would reply, but not so much good either ; they are all old and dull, so dull and so stereotyped, but my play is something different, something *quite unusual* (apūrva). The Sūtradhāra in the Vik. says as much and all this in the prologue.*

(There was another reason as to why Kālidāsa boasted of his play as unusual (apūrva), in spite of its plot, development and characters being of the early standardised type. In his enthusiasm for music and dance Kālidāsa had boldly introduced a new feature which, as he thought, was also more dramatic on the stage. That new feature was the whole of Act IV where for the most part only one character—that of the hero-king Vikrama moved on the stage. The king was virtually mad. He had lost his beloved Urvaśī ; he would not rest till he found her out. This mood of the hero was most favourable to a variety of music and dance. Secondly, to remove the possibility of the scene growing monotonous to the audience Kālidāsa introduced two ethereal nymphs who kept on singing and humming, in Prākṛt melodies, an allegory about an elephant-king madly in search of his beloved.* The hero-king was so mad that he would stop anything that crossed his path to inquire of his Urvaśī. Thus, he asks a cloud, an elephant, a bee and so on. Could we *imagine* that these various objects were somehow represented on the stage ? In that case the king would disappear from the stage for some time (the nymphs, during the while, sang their allegory). Could we *further imagine* a representation like the following ? The hero asked an elephant, got, of course, no reply, and so walked out of the stage ; in the meanwhile, a bee was shown on the stage, the king re-entered to find the bee whom he asked as before, got no reply and so walked away as before and so on. With such an im-

8. mārīṣa, bahuśas tu pūrveṣāṃ kavīnāṃ dr̥ṣṭaḥ prayoga-bandhaḥ /
so'ham adya vikramorvaśīyam nāma a-pūrvam nāṭakam prayokṣye.

9. Re. the arguments that the Prākṛt melodies in Act IV are spurious, see R. B. S. P. Pandit's edition. In maintaining that those passages are genuine we have not followed the arguments advanced against R. B. Pandit by Prof. R. D. Karmarkar (in his edition of the Vik. and others).

pressive stage-movement it is no wonder that Kālidāsa should be proud of his original (apūrvā) device; but, to his surprise and indignation, he saw, watching during his first production more the audience than the play as any young dramatist would, that his device had not pleased the audience or at least that it did not strike them and like all other young dramatists he walked home shaking his head half in pity and half in anger,¹⁰ for the audience which was too stupid to see his originality.)

Great writer as he was (to be), Kālidāsa was neither dismayed nor discouraged. Day by day he was finding more and more of the dramatist in himself and from now on he was not going to be dictated, to either by tradition or by public taste. He would rather care, if at all, for the judgment of the discerning few since they could, if ever, form an independent opinion about any thing and on its merits while the (so-called) public taste had no deep roots in convictions but grew up like a mushroom, anywhere and any time.

All this Kālidāsa said in as many words in the prologue to his second play, the Mālav., where the Sūtradhāra says rather contemptuously.

aye viveka-viśrāntam abhihitam paśya,
purānam ityeva na sādhu sarvaṃ
na cāpi kāvyam navam ityavadyam
santaḥ parikṣyānyatarad bhajante
mūḍhah para-pratyayaneya-buddhiḥ

"Your talk has no reason in it; anything* is not good simply because it is old, and any work is not bad simply because it is new. The experts compare, decide and choose while the ignorant follow the opinions of others."¹¹

(To say that only old plays are good or that no new play could be good is just to talk nonsense. Secondly, a play is not mere recitation or narration as most of the old plays are. A play is essentially a representation or as Paṇḍita-Kauśika says in Mālav. I, prayoga-pradhānam hi nāṭya-śāstram, a drama is essentially a performance. With this theory of his Kālidāsa was prepared even to risk the disapproval of the learned. "Only fools cater to the good

10 It would have been all pity if he were to know that any explanation that his device (with the prākṛt melodies) is genuine is rejected by some modern scholars by saying that it is a strain on the imagination.

11 Mālav I-2

opinion of the learned," says the wise Vidūṣaka.¹² But luckily the discerning few were so pleased with the stage device (prayoga) in the Vik. that they requested the stage-manager (Sūtradhāra) to produce Kālidāsa's Mālavikāgnimitram.¹³

Thus does Kālidāsa boldly stand, in his second play, all for art as he sees it. He pities those good writers who compromise with public taste at the expense of their art. Theirs is not art but commerce; to earn a livelihood they sell their knowledge.¹⁴

So he sets out to treat his story in a new fashion. In itself, the story of the Mālav. is the usual one of a King's love to a pretty girl, mixed with the follies and intrigues of the Vidūṣaka and with jealousies within the harem. But the whole atmosphere, the entire development are of an original type. Music, dance, painting and fine arts (Śilpa) on the one hand and the ingenuity of the Vidūṣaka on the other, place this love-story on a different plane. Kālidāsa insists that the love of his hero-king is not of a coarse type. When the king saw Mālavikā's (the heroine's) portrait he was just attracted, but when he saw her sing and dance he was simply conquered. Thus in II-14 says the hero :

sarvāntahpura-vanitā-vyāparam prati nivṛtta-hṛdayasya
sā vāma-locanā me snehasyaikāyanībhūtā.

"My heart is turned from the ladies of the harem; this pretty-eyed one is my all and only attraction."

Secondly, the whole credit for the development of the plot belongs to the Vidūṣaka. By starting a quarrel between her two teachers, he made it possible for the heroine to be personally brought before the hero; and then the play unfolds itself (Acts I and II). On the occasion of the *dohada* function of the Aśoka tree the Vidūṣaka caused (deliberately) the queen to stumble from the swing so that, disabled as she (the queen) was, the function had to be delegated to Mālavikā (III). When Mālavikā was imprisoned by the jealous queen, the Vidūṣaka feigned snake-bite, acquired the queen's signet, and thus seeking an entry brought the hero to the imprisoned heroine (IV). In all this the Vidūṣaka is not the supposed court-fool; his

12. Bhagavati, paṇḍita-paritoṣa-pratyayā nanu mūdhā jātiḥ (Mālav. II).

13. Cf. abhīhito śmī vidvat-parīṣadā etc. (*Ibid.* Prologue)

14. Yasyāgamah Kevalajivikaiva tam jñāna-pāpyam vaṇijam vadanti (*Ibid.* I-17)

plans, too, are brilliant in his own way. One might boldly assert that the play was written entirely for the sake of the Vidūṣaka's character.

Such an assumption is not fanciful or far-fetched. Kālidāsa, it appears, has a defined purpose in making the whole play revolve round the Vidūṣaka. In the Mālav. the Vidūṣaka is not the standardised fool; on the other hand, as already mentioned,¹⁵ Gautama, as he is called here, has a fund of common-sense. Only a close student of human nature could successfully incite two sufficiently cultured men like the teachers to quarrel among themselves. Gautama does it. He has an independent eye for beauty as when, on the entrance of Mālavikā, he says to the King :

prekṣatām bhavān, na khalu asyāḥ praticchandāt
panhīyate madhuratā

"The charm of the original is no less than that of the portrait"
(II).

His field of observation is wide and his application apt as could be seen in remarks like—

(i) daridra ātura iva vaidyena upanīyamānam auśadham
iccasi.

"You are like a poor patient who looks to a doctor's medicine (which he cannot afford)." (II)

(ii) sā tapasvinī nāga-rakṣitā iva nidhir va sukham samāsā-
dayatavyā.

"That poor dear is not easy to win like treasure guarded over by a cobra." (III)

(iii) aho kumbhūlakāḥ kāmukaiśca parihaṇīyā candrikā.

"Oh! Thieves and lovers should avoid moonlight." (IV)

His ready-wittedness too is apparent as when in Act IV he relieves the tension of an awkward situation with an apt remark :

sādhu re pīṅgala vānara. suṣṭhu paritrātas
tvayā saṅkatāt sapakṣah.

"Bravo Pīṅgala, my monkey; thanks for saving your caste-fellow from a difficulty."

It is such a character with common-sense that gives a realistic touch to the entire atmosphere of the play. In the company of this Vidūṣaka the hero could never sink into that melodramatic and

monotonous type as usual. Like an innocent, smiling child he brings a smile to every sour or serious-looking face around him. His realism is both infectious and provoking. The scene of the quarrelling teachers and that of the jealous queen, Irāvati—are natural responses to the Vidūṣaka's realistic mentality. The Vidūṣaka, in essence, is the worldly type of man. Wherever he moves, the ways of the world (*loka-carita*) move too. With the creation of one such character the genius of Kālidāsa has enlarged the scope of drama. A drama is no longer a romantic biography of fairy prince but a realistic representation of the ways of the world. The Vidūṣaka—a kind of Mr. Everyman—has found a high place in literature. It is Mr. Everyman and not an Avatar that belongs to the world. So, to understand the world one must first study the average man, the rightful and the long-established inhabitant of this globe.

The study of the average man is always the beginning but not always the end of the study of the world and its ways. The world is something more than what the average man makes or thinks it to be. It has a definite past, so it must be having a future. The average man is guided by the past, so he will be goaded by the future. Though he knows it not, man is a product of the unfathomable past and may be, likewise, a result in the fathomless future. Thus man is a conscious citizen of this globe, but an unconscious citizen of the world that was and of the world to be. Whether he likes it or not, the student of the world has to face this conclusion. Kālidāsa was not brought up in vain in the Hindu traditions. His reasoning led him direct to such a conclusion. He was himself floating out of the yawning past and visualised himself helpless in the future. Was it his intellectual struggle, supremacy and solitariness that drove him to raise his hands to the Almighty to be saved from the world-to-be? His last words in his last play—the *Abhijñāna Śākuntalam* betray the helplessness of an honest intellect before its own brilliance. "Let the King turn to his subjects' welfare; let the learned learn to grow wiser" (i.e. let the innocent fools grow at least more innocent and more foolish) but, runs the supplication—

mamāpi ca kṣapayatu nīlalohitaḥ
punarbhavam parigata-śaktir ātmabhūḥ

"Let the Inner God, Nīlalocita, whose powers enmesh me, let him—let him save me from the world to be." 16

paraspara-prāpti-nirāśayor varam
śarīra-nāśopī samānurāgayoh.

"I would not be pleased at the union, though successful, of the two where one is longing and the other not; where each loves the other with the same intensity it matters not even if they die in despair."

So we find that in his last play Kālidāsa has depicted Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā in a different way. As the play opens Duṣyanta enters chasing a stag and throughout the play Duṣyanta is more a king with manly habits but never the usual hero-king sickening yet surfeited with love. The opening speech of the Vidūṣaka in Act II emphasises Duṣyanta's love for hunting; if we are to reject the Vidūṣaka's account as exaggerated the Army Commander comes in to correct us. Hunting, he says, is a virtue with King Duṣyanta, who, so to say, is built of sterner stuff (II-3). That Duṣyanta is a dutiful and conscientious king is obvious.¹⁷ No hero-king of a love-story has anywhere else been depicted in this light. Such a Duṣyanta one least expects to be involved in a love-affair. Likewise, Śakuntalā is not, like other heroines, brought up in the traditions of luxury and amorousness. And lastly, the hermitage is the last place for cupid's trade to flourish. And yet such a hero and such a heroine fall in love with each other amidst such surroundings! Here is Love; Love that is free and healthy, Love that is not only nursed, nourished and consummated in a hermitage (the laps of Mother Nature so to say) but that is never allowed into the interior of towns with slums, or courts of corruption, or of palaces of petty-mindedness, i.e. never allowed into the interior of hum-drum life.¹⁸ This world of ours is destined not to love, so it does not live. Life is love, says Kālidāsa, and love is eternal. Life too should then be eternal, shouldn't it? But just like love, life on the terrestrial

17. Cf. V 4, 5. Also—

vetravatī, madvacanād amātyam āryapiśunam brūhi.
ciraprabodhanān na sambhāvitam asmābhir adya dharmāsanam
adhyāsītum. yat pratyavekṣitam paurakāryam āryeṇa tat
patram āropya diyatam iti.

"Vetravati, let the minister know that we have not sat in Council today as we left our bed quite late. So whatever affairs have been gone through by the Minister should be despatched to us in writing" (Act VI).

18. So in Act V Śakuntalā only passes through the town as if only to bring to our notice the conditions of the palace and city.

globe is not consummated. Even a powerful (and super-human) king like the mythical Vikrama suffers as long as he is on this mortal globe [Sukha-pratyarthitā daivasya : Oh ! how fate banters human happiness ! is his cry (Vik. V)]. This, however, is not a counsel of despair. Kālidāsa tells us that Vikrama is going to the Heavens to help Indra and there he will have his beloved Urvaśī all the rest of his days. Similarly, earthly love is held in intellectual mockery in the Mālav. against the background of the Vidūṣaka's petty intrigues. What wonder then if Kālidāsa should raise his hands in supplication and cry out,

„Let the Inner God, Nīlāhita, whose powers enmesh me, let him—let him save me from the world to be.”

* * *

From the foregoing it will be seen that Kālidāsa stands apart from his predecessors as an artist. Art and life differ in that the former is the achievement of intellect and intuition while the latter runs mostly along instincts. (“Any operation” says George Santayana, “which thus humanises and rationalises objects is called art”¹⁹) Drama with Kālidāsa fulfils that function consciously for the first time in Sanskrit literature. Drama is not the mere representation of life, but the presentation of an outlook on life, the presentation of life in the light of that outlook. The more we study Kālidāsa the more we find that drama as an art is entirely changing into his hands. It is not mere story-telling as in the earlier plays ; it is not mere poetic outburst as, we shall see, in most of the later plays. It does not preach morality at a time when moralists were invading the fortresses of literature. Drama here is suggestive first and suggestive last. What does it suggest ? (1) The beauty of Man. (2) The beauty of Him whose handwork man is. As for the first, Kālidāsa had long before anticipated Hamlet's sentiments about man. He could also say “What a piece of work is man ! How noble in reason ! How infinite in faculties ! In form and moving, how express and admirable ! In action how like an angel ! In apprehension, how like a God ! The beauty of the world ! The paragon of animals”²⁰ Like Hamlet too Kālidāsa saw man as “this quintessence of dust.” But unlike to Hamlet, man delights Kālidāsa. The reason-

19. The Life of Reason (Reason in Art), p. 4.

20. Hamlet Act, II, Sc. ii.

for this is man's parentage and heritage. To both i.e. parentage and heritage, man is an unconscious servant. Work against God, work against Nature man could not. How far man is a creature of his surroundings Kālidāsa has exquisitely shown in Acts I and VII of the *A. Śāk.* In the last Act Duṣyanta enters the hermitage of sage Mārīca in the heavenly world. Immediately his right arm throbs (VII-13). What is the use? he asks. But the surroundings remind him of an earlier and similar occasion when the same arm had throbbed (I-14). And the consequences? Better not think about them. No sooner he decides to remain indifferent than words are heard from behind the stage. "mā khalu cāpalam kuru,—do not be rash." As soon as Duṣyanta heard them, he might have started in terror. Were not similar words addressed to him (in Act I) by the hermits? He is immediately thrown back to the old days. Oh! how pleased were then the hermits with him! How they blessed him "to be the father of a world-conqueror" (I-12)! Alas! where is all that now? Duṣyanta who, in Act I, could come to quick decisions in utmost confidence (cf. I-19) could not now be confident about things quite reasonable. Just as he is living his past, wishing that the hermits' blessings were come true, imagining what a bright boy he would have had for a son—lo, what is this? He is seeing a boy (Sarvadamana) before him! All the parental feelings fanned by memory Duṣyanta now showers on the boy that comes on the stage. Like one in dream he actually wishes the boy were his own. Is he a world-conqueror? Look, here is the boy's palm bearing all the marks of a world conqueror! Poor Duṣyanta! The more he was reminded of earlier scenes the more he felt like one who had burnt his fingers when the female ascetic (who accompanies the boy on the stage) kindles his hopes by observing a close resemblance between the boy and himself.²¹ Duṣyanta dare not come to a decision. If we remember the younger Duṣyanta in Act I, who within a few moments after seeing Śakuntalā decides that she must be a girl worthy of a Kṣatriya, since a cultured heart like his is drawn towards her,²² we see how thoroughly Duṣyanta has now been shaken. Apart from that, he could not escape the influence of earlier memories revived under

21. asya bālasya te'pi samvādinī śṅkṛtiḥ iti viśmāpitāsmi

I am surprised that the figure and features of this boy and yourself should resemble so.

22. I-19.

similar circumstances.²³ All this is not so much explained as suggested. The materials are the ways of the human world. They are embodied in the dramatist's observation. Some sort of an atmosphere is created, set against which one or two incidents of every day life are made to appear as illustrations of human conduct and character. In the history of past Sanskrit drama, the craft of the Master has inspired only one or two dramatists while, with the others, history repeated itself by standardising an earlier originality.

23. Thus might be an explanation of the word *abhijāna* or *praty-abhijāna* in the title of the play. The word means "recognition."

CHAPTER XIV

THE MR̥CCHAKAṬIKA OF ŚŪDRAKA

We left Sanskrit Drama in the last chapter as a plant blossoming in congenial soil of contemporary social life. As a piece of literary art it fulfilled two functions; (1) it *represented*, as far as necessary, contemporary life which served as a background, and (2) it *presented* the dramatist's definite outlook on life. Kālidāsa who was the first to introduce these features was, like any other innovating genius, a revolutionary. The peculiarity of a revolution is that the followers are more fanatical than the originators. As in politics, so in literature. Thus in the post-Kālidāsa period, one would expect plays that exploit the art of the Master. To such set of plays belongs the Mr̥cchakaṭika ('The Toy-Cart') attributed to king Śūdraka.

In the first place it should be borne in mind that apart from the question whether Śūdraka wrote it or not the Mr̥cchakaṭika definitely belongs to the post-Kālidāsa period. It is not our present object to discuss the date of authors; nor is such a discussion of any practical value to us. Śūdraka is a mythical character. The information about him given in the prologue to the play is too ridiculous to be utilised in a reasonable discussion. It is not the author's but the play's date that matters to us. (It is more likely for two or more persons to have one and the same name than for two or more plays to go by one and the same title.)

The story of the play would be referred to below. In the story is a sub-plot related to the incidents of a political revolution. Political revolutions, however, seem to have been such simple affairs in those days as to occur any and every day. It was as easy perhaps to occupy a throne in those days as it is for any bully in these days to occupy a seat in a third-class railway compartment. The upheaval would not affect the by-standers—unless as a piece of curiosity to those inclined idly enough.

A comparatively more important fact is that the play utilises more characters, both male and female, belonging to the lower society. Consequently the dialects used (i.e. the prākṛts used) are various (such as śaurasenī, avantī, prācyā, māgadhi and the apabh-

rañśas, śākārī, cāṇḍālī and dhakka) The greater part of the play is in the dialects. Of the twenty-four or twenty-five male characters only five speak in Sanskrit. Of these five Cārudatta is the hero of the play ; Āryaka is the hero of the revolution ; Śarvilaka, a Brahmin of high culture skilled in breaking men's houses and women's hearts ; a gambler named Dardūraka ; and the Court-Examiner (adhikāranaka). This fact may or may not be useful in determining the date of the play. Nevertheless it suggests one thing viz , that the play was probably written at a time when not only the Prākṛt dialects but even the apabhrañśas were freely used and the employment of the dialects as such was more frequent.

Similarly the very development and the subject-matter of the play might throw some light on the time the play was written in. Throughout the play the hard hand of the Fate is felt. Even when everything was destined to end happily the hero is moved to compare the human beings tossed by fate to buckets of water tossed by a water-wheel now up and now down. (eṣa kṛidati kūpa-yantra-ghaṭikā-nyāya-prasakto vidhiḥ)¹ Buddhism is mentioned in the play in all its details and there is an actual conversion of a menial to Buddhism. (By the way, one might wonder whether, in case the author were a Buddhist, a character of a higher status would have been converted to Buddhism.) On the whole those were days of unsettled conditions and an indifferent government. Each of the observations in itself may not be of any help ; but the rough life represented in the play read along with the revolution and the Buddhistic conversion (of a menial) would suggest a time immediately following the disruption of a central authority and a time when Buddhism was tolerated because it did not affect the established Hindu life. The Saṁvāhaka whose life, for a long time, is anything but reputable turns at last into a Buddhist monk and, in a fit of generosity that affects a dramatist of the 'happy-end' school, the Saṁvāhaka is made the imperial head, so to say, of all the Buddhist vihāras. Such a time we could not imagine immediately after the disruption of the Maūryan Empire since Buddhism then was a court fashion ; besides, the Apabhrañśa dialects were yet to

1. X. 59 Also cf. Act VI where the hero's son wants the gold cart used by a neighbourly boy and the heroine sighs on this : bhagavan kṛtānta, puṣkara-patra-patita-jala-biṇḍu-saḍṛśaiḥ kṛidasi tvam puruṣa-bhāgaḍheyaiḥ.

-evolve. The next Empire built which tumbled down in its turn was the Gupta Empire. After its downfall in the middle of the fifth century A.D., Buddhism might have once again raised its head (as the frequent visits of the Chinese pilgrims indicate) till King Harṣa sealed its fate forever by linking it with politics in the middle of the 7th century A.D. Is it possible that the play was written somewhere between the fall of the Gupta Empire and the rise of King Harṣa? Could we, for example, read such a meaning in the fourth verse of Act VIII where the Viṭa describes the park as follows—

aśaraṇa-śaraṇa-pramoḍa-bhūtaiḥ
 vana-tarubhiḥ kriyamāṇa-cāru-karma,
 hṛdayam iva durātmānam a-guṇṭam
 navam iva rājyam anirjitopabhogyam.

"Here the trees are doing a good deal by joyfully offering shelter to the homeless; the park (however) is like the untutored (i.e. uncultured) heart of the wicked; it is like a new kingdom the titleship (upabhogyā) to which is not yet proved." In the above, we can understand a pun on the word "a-guṇṭa" and the meaning as, "It is like the heart of the wicked; it is like a kingdom where the Guptas are no more and the new kings have not established their authority." Further we may note that Āryaka who is successful in the revolution is called a gopāla-dāraka.² Leaving the above questions unanswered for the time being let us come to another striking feature viz., the influence of Kālidāsa throughout the play. Certain phrases and ideas are more obviously perceptible.

(1) In Act I when the heroine is taking off her ornaments to hand them over to Śakāra the Viṭa says, na puṣpamoṣam arhati udyāna-latā "let not the garden-creeper be deprived of its flowers." One is immediately reminded of Kālidāsa who in A. Śāk. 1-15 compares a woodland lass to vana-latā (a forest creeper and a town-beauty to udyāna-latā, a garden creeper).

(2) In Act I again the same Viṭa, on learning that the heroine is in love with Cārudatta, says: suṣṭhu khalu idam ucyate, ratnam ratnena saṁgacchata. The context as well as the contents of the above remark remind one of Kālidāsa's words in a similar situation in Raghu. VI-79 viz.,

2. Cf. also Act VII, tatahpraviśati guptāryaka-pravahanaṣṭhaḥ.

tvam atmanas tulyam amum vṛnīṣva
ratnam samāgacchatu kāñcanena.

"This person suits you well ; choose him, let jewel be studded with gold." The Vita in Mṛcch., however, quotes (ucyate, it is said) "let jewel be studded with jewel."

(3) In Act IX Cārudatta protests that he did not murder Vasantasēnā. As a matter of fact, he *could* not. How could he? He would not injure even a plant by plucking its flowers. (IX-28 yo 'ham latām kusumitām api puṣpahētor ākṛṣya naiva kusumāvacāyam karomi.) The fine sentiment expressed here takes one to an equally delicate situation in A. Śāk where Śakuntalā is described by her father in similar words (IV-8. nādatte priya-maṇḍanāpi bhavatām snēhēna yā pallavam ; she loves to adorn herself with flowers but she loves you—trees—more than that and so she doesn't pluck a single sprout).

Instances could be multiplied.³ More important still is the influence on the technique and the handling of the Mṛcch. The hero and the heroine and the atmosphere of the Mṛcch. are worldly in the first place ; and the idea developed is the same as that of Kālidāsa. The hero and the heroine of the latter are mythical (in A. Śāk.) while those of Śūdraka are matter of fact. 'Love is Life' is the text of Kālidāsa ; 'Love in Life' is the text of Śūdraka. Kālidāsa chose the unconventional (from the point of view of the subject) atmosphere of a hermitage ; Śūdraka chose the unconventional quarters of a courtesan. Love, in Kālidāsa, is consummated in another world ; Love, in Śūdraka, is consummated in another atmosphere (viz., after the revolution). In both, love is studied in so far as it affects character. Action there is in Śūdraka's play but it does not happen on the stage. The play is a character-study. It is like a mirror-house where each one of the ten acts is a mirror wherein a person is seen from a particular view-point. The play is suggestive of the relations of man to and of his place in the society. In doing this it follows in the foot-steps of Kālidāsa.

In order to see exactly the significance of the statement that Śūdraka's handling etc. is influenced by Kālidāsa we have to analyse minutely the structure of his (Śūdraka's) play. The story was probably better known before the play. Cārudatta, a poor Brahmin, falls in love with Vasantasēnā, a courtesan of culture. Śakāra, the brother-

3. Cf. Mṛcch. IX-29 and Vik. IV-13. The last line of the former is addressed to Śakāra.

in-law of the ruling king, has met with rebuffs at the hands of the courtesan ; so all his fury is now against Cārudatta. A mistake in taking a carriage leads Vasantasēnā into Śakāra's private gardens. The latter, unable to win, strikes her and thinking her to be dead runs away. Next we find him busy accusing Cārudatta, in a court of law, of Vasantasēnā's murder. Nothing can save the hero who is now led to the gallows. In the meanwhile Aryaka who, during his escape from the prison, was protected by Cārudatta is now successful in the revolution and, as his first act after coronation, saves Cārudatta from the gallows. Vasantasēnā too had only fainted when Śakāra left her and now she runs into the untied arms of Cārudatta.

The story above is the reader's construction and not what the dramatist tells directly. The situations introduced by the dramatist are suggestive in themselves. In creating the atmosphere, devices like the evening time in Act I or midnight in Act III or the clouds and the thunder and the lightning in Act V etc. are improvements on Kālidāsa. They also show a greater mastery over the technique. So the story is not told but suggested, or, we might say that the story is presented in a way that suggests what the dramatist feels and thinks about it. To depict the love between the hero and the heroine is not the purpose of Śūdraka. That they love each other he tells us at the very beginning of Act I. There is something else that the dramatist wants to depict and for this he builds in Act I the outlines within which the possibilities of the development are to be described. The interest centres on Vasantasēnā, the heroine. Keen and appreciative in observation, graceful in movements, sprightly in behaviour, confident and courageous she personifies in herself the Joy in Life (the same as Śakuntalā in A. Śāk. I). In theory accessible to all (as a courtesan), in fact inclined to the few deserving, from the moment she is seen fleeing from the vulgar in life (Śakāra) to seek safety in sympathy amidst culture and sincerity (at Cārudatta) we admire her courage, we appreciate her position and we identify ourselves with her fears and frolics. On one side is the poor but cultured and youthful Brāhmin disgusted (with his poverty) and despairing (as any other youth would); on the other is the rich but uncultured Śakāra. While the Brāhmin has tasted the miseries of life to grow wiser and more sympathetic, Śakāra has tasted the pleasures of a high position only to grow self-centred and spiteful. Both are outwardly encouraged and helped in their respective behaviour by their friends and servants. The Brāhmin earns love from

his friend Maitrēyaka while Śakāra buys service from his Vita. Between such extremes is Vasantasēna placed and it is no wonder if she comes to be the point of clash.

Act I suggests the possibilities of such a clash. Cārudatta is introduced in his characteristics as a well-bred and well-behaving householder. The time is night when the evil forces are supposed to be let loose. Like the darkness of the night comes Śakāra, so swift and so dangerous. It is a welcome accident which gives a chance to Vasantasēnā to observe the contrast between Śakāra roaming like a hell-hound and Cārudatta quite a picture of decency. The hero also has a chance of seeing Vasantasēnā, not the courtesan as she would be at home with coquettish smiles and cunning eyes. He sees those very eyes now seeking safety, that very figure now hunted in ugly cruelty. The gallant youth and the admiring courtesan forgot for a moment their respective positions, that one was a man with no means and the other a woman of no status. In their very helplessness these two social outlaws ran into each other's arms. Time was not yet. The Joy of Life knocked at the gates of Nobility but the latter had not the power to retain it. So Vasantasēnā is sent home.

If Act I shows the hero at home and the heroine outside, Act II shows the hero in the outer world and the heroine at home. Poor Vasantasēnā ! in her filthy surroundings where vagabonds and drunkards and gamblers swear and brawl and drink ! Filthier still is the atmosphere that her mother breathes into Vasantasēnā's room. It is a hard fight for the heroine. A woman of no status ! Is it possible that a woman who is fighting against such surroundings has no status ? Her heart goes, as if to escape, out of the window where on the road Cārudatta has given away his only garment in appreciation of gallant work. A poor Brāhmin and a man of no means ! Suddenly her fight is over. No longer is she a woman of no status, nor is Cārudatta a man of no means. What is true is character. The hero, in spite of poverty, retains his character and, the heroine, in spite of surroundings, establishes her character. They are now indispensable to each other since the heart of each throbs for the life of the other.

Act III shows the hero once again at home but now he has entirely changed. Love or the Joy of Life has vitalised his feelings. No longer does he sit at home cursing poverty, but enjoys his capacity to enjoy. It is *Love* and not *love for Vasantasēnā* which makes him rise, in his love of music, above the humdrum and into the

harmony of Life. From that height we laugh at the worldly worries of the Vidūṣaka (Maitrēyaka), we generally forgive the wicked ways of the world and of the thief, and not until we meet the noble wife of Cārudatta do we descend to the earth. In the meanwhile, the neglected world has played a trick by removing the symbol of the Joy of Life in the form of the gold ornaments deposited by Vasantasēnā in Act I.

Act IV shows us that this symbol *had* to disappear now. Its work was done. It came and conquered and then it took the tale of that conquest to its mistress. Paths of love seem to run in a circle. The thief loved the heroine's maid and so the stolen goods found their way back to the heroine. The fact that the hero attempted to replace the symbol only shows how perfect its conquest was. The man with no means is now the richest, richest in character; the woman with no status is now the noblest—in her appreciation of nobility; and (Act V) in the midst of the mad world protesting, flashing, threatening and thundering the two are united.

To an average mind the story ends here. But the Mṛcchakatika, as said above, is not a love-story but a story of Love. This Love is all-creative. It creates itself before it creates all. Whatever it touches it vitalises and is ever vitalising. It builds a home, it sets up a society and so in Act VI we meet Vasantasēnā mothering her lover's little boy. That boy has a clay-cart which he does not like; she helps him, with her ornaments, to get a golden cart. In a moment she herself is in the wrong cart—the cart she would never have liked. Śākāra's cart is detained owing to congestion on the road outside Cārudatta's house. Vasantasēnā gets into it mistaking it for her lover's cart and speeds headlong into the jaws of death. So does Cārudatta whose cart has been occupied by the run-away rebel with a price on his head whom our hero forgives and helps to escape. Thus the hero and the heroine are in the grips of cruel fate. But that fate is here nothing but the little accidents caused by the irresponsible Joy of Life itself. Acts VI and VII tell us that the Joy of Life has to wade through the underworld of misery if it should illuminate the latter. So when Vasantasēnā, in Act VIII, falls down struck by the mad jealousy of Śākāra she does so not before she evokes the best traits in Viṭa and the Cēṣa. "The stores-house of Joy and Grace is looted" says the Viṭa when he sees the lifeless body of Vasantasēnā. "Master," the poor cartman chokes out, "Master, you have committed a grave sin!" When Śākāra confronts both of

them face him in a rebellious attitude. As for the heroine we need not be anxious. Her own good deeds come to save her in the form of the Samvāhaka whom she had earlier saved from the gamblers and who is now a Buddhist mendicant. In Act IX Cārudatta is hauled up before the authorities charged with Vasantasēnā's murder. But the whole scene serves more the purpose of showing how the mere presence of the hero is enough to evoke the best not only in the Court-examiner and the Assessors but even in that vile mother of Vasantasēnā. As to his own safety once again, good deeds of the past revive to redeem. He is, for the present, condemned to death not because the Court-examiner was convinced nor that the Assessors or the mother believed in his guilt, but, ironically enough, on the evidence of those very ornaments with which Vasantasēnā had filled his son's cart and which the Vidūśaka, during a scuffle, scatters in the court. Whatever it is, the clay-cart now fulfils its functions as a symbol of the miserable world uplifted by the touch of the joy of life. The rebel whose life was saved by Cārudatta has now succeeded and his first deed as a king is to set Cārudatta free. The joy in life has now rejuvenated the world and Vasantasēnā is re-united with Cārudatta. Without Cārudatta's help Āryaka would not have been a king and but for Vasantasēnā Cārudatta would have had no chance of saving Āryaka.

• • •

(We have discussed the play at such length for two reasons; (1) the *Mṛcchakatika* is the only (at least, available) play of the dramatist, and (2) the play shows the new departure introduced by Kālidāsa, in broader lines. It was said in connexion with the *Mālav.* that Kālidāsa, with the creation of the worldly Vidūśaka, brought drama nearer to life. This feature was emphasised in A. Śāk. by the creation of the living characters and scenes with life. Śakuntalā as a sprightly girl laughing and enjoying in the company of her friends (I); as a love-sick maiden (III); as a wife recognising her responsibilities (IV); as a mother fighting for her position (V); and as a woman prepared at all costs to share with man the pains and pleasures of life—this Śakuntalā lives in everyday life and thought. So does Duṣyanta, a healthy young man with healthy tastes (I and II), a lover of beauty and innocence (III), a man knowing and shouldering his responsibilities (V and VI) and kind-hearted father (VII). Likewise the family life, with all intimacies and intri-

cacies, is realistically depicted in Act IV. The *Mrcchakatika*, too, introduces life on the stage. The scene of the gamblers in the disreputable locality (II), that of the cartmen driving their carts on crowded roads (VI, VII, VIII), the one where the thief effects a break into the wall (IV) or where Śakāra and his friends chase Vasantasēna in a dark corner of the road (I) or where the two police-officers quarrel (VI)—all these are the scenes from the matter of fact world. With these two dramatists Sanskrit drama pulsates with the currents in social life. The art of Kālidāsa is fresh, that of Śūdraka is powerful. Both, however, are artists to the very tips of their fingers.)

of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Secondly, some original treatise on the art of recitation or on *rasa* as composed by a Bharata might have been amplified with reference to later developments. Or, lastly, original short studies on various topics concerned with recitation, representation, voice-cultivation, physical culture etc. might have been edited in an encyclopaedic form. Surmises like these are proposed not with the intention of going round a difficulty to avoid it but on the actual, textual evidence. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* in its available form is bewildering by its construction and chaos. (On first observation its construction seems so compact and so comprehensive; at the same time there is so much that seems senseless and superfluous—as the following analysis would show.

Chapter I is in the usual vein, singing the glories of the book. It proves its divine origin and establishes the sanction of antiquity by declaring that *nāṭya* is (i) the creation of God Brahmā and (ii) the fifth Veda open to all castes. This fifth Veda was created from out of the four Vedas (Verse 17). "Here", said Brahmā to the gods, "here have I produced an *itihāsa*" (19). But the gods were unable to perform it, so sage Bharata was approached. Bharata had an enviable advantage in his hundred sons (26-39). However, he found out that in the fifth Veda sons alone had not the monopoly, as in the other four Vedas, of taking their father to *svarga* and success and salvation. So he had to request Brahmā to create Apsaras damsels to play female rôles. With these initial preparations a *nāṇḍī* and an *anukṛti* [probably a (panto-) mimic show] of the fight between gods and demons were represented (59) on the festive occasion of Indra's victory (56. *Mahendra-vijayotsave*). The demons naturally resented this public display of their defeat and raided the performance. A *nāṭyagrha* (playhouse) had thus to be created as a protective measure. In the meanwhile Brahmā pacifies the demons by singing a lyrical panegyric of *nāṭya* (which is shown to have too noble an aim to vilify or libel the demons). The playhouse is constructed and on Brahmā's order Bharata performs the *raṅga-pūjā* ('worshipping the stage').²

Chapter II describes in great detail the various ways of building playhouses as well as the various models of playhouses. The

2. The word *raṅga* (or *rañj*)—might mean 'red-colour' or 'paint', *raṅga*—as a noun meaning 'the painted place' where originally we can imagine one painted curtain as the background.

whole description is introduced edgeways. At the end of the last chapter Bharata was asked to perform the *raṅga-pūjā* and immediately after is described not the *raṅga-pūjā* but the construction of the *nāṭya-grha* (which has been constructed already in I 80-83). Even at that Bharata does not describe the house that has been actually built but engages in a lengthy and general description of three kinds of playhouses—the *vikṛṣṭa* (II 34-6), the *caturasra* (89 ff) and the *tryasra* (102). The *vikṛṣṭa* seems, as its root-meaning (viz. 'long drawn out') suggests, to have been an oblong hall with the audience facing the stage at one end. The *caturasra* was different since the audience here could be seated on four sides of the stage—either in a circle or perpendicular to the stage—in the centre. The *tryasra* is a sort of modification of the last-mentioned—the audience being on three sides (right, left and front) of the stage. The stage itself was a kind of platform raised on wooden pillars. The place below the platform was the *nepathya-grha*—the entrance to the platform being by a passage on the side away from the audience. The raised part (the platform) was known as the *raṅga-śiṛṣa*. Certain characters had to effect an entrance not on the platform but in—between the audience and the platform. This space was known as the *raṅga-pīṭha*. Such an entrance was made by removing the piece of cloth hanging on the front side of the platform to screen the green-room below. Probably the *raṅga-pūjā* was performed in the green-room *beneath the platform*.

Chapter III continues the description of this *raṅga-pūjā* mentioned in Chapter I—thus showing the contextual irrelevance of Chapter II. In IV the *raṅga-pūjā* is over and a 'samavakāra' (by name *Amyta-manthana*) is represented. This representation must have been a sort of pantomimic show since it is said (IV-4) that the audience was pleased with the 'karma-bhāva-anudaśana' as contrasted with the 'karma-bhāva-anukīrtana' (IV-11) of a 'ḍima' later performed in the presence of God Śiva. *Anukīrtana* probably refers to recitation and *anudaśana* to mere (i.e. mute) representation. Bharata is then advised by Śiva to introduce dancing in the *pūrvaraṅga* (overture) and deputed Taṇḍu (18) to teach the *tāṇḍava* dance (258a). The sages to whom Bharata is supposed to narrate his *śāstra* ask him (258b-260a) why dancing which is connected neither with the music of the *pūrvaraṅga* nor with the sense of the play proper should be included in the show. Bharata replies, to the dismay of some modern critics (or better, fanatics), that dancing, though not

essential to or in a play, adds to the beauty of the show and the amusement of the audience. Verses 19 to 257 describe the various gestures (*karāṇa*), postures (*aṅgaḥāra*) and "movements" (*recaka*) of dancing. For the present we are inclined to suspect these verses since they so violently separate the name of Tāṇḍu (18) from his derivative tāṇḍava (258a). Chapter V describes anew the *pūrva-raṅga* modified in the light of Śiva's instructions.)

Chapters VI and VII deal with the *rasa*-s and the *bhāva*-s. This subject is not introduced as in any way arising naturally out of the previous discussion. After the *pūrva-raṅga* one fails to see the necessity of explaining in great details the various *rasa*-s etc. What does it matter if the sages choose to ask (not one but) five irrelevant questions: (i) What is a *rasa*? (ii) What is a *bhāva*? What is meant by (iii) a *saṁgraha*, (iv) a *kārikā* and (v) *nirukta*? (VI-1-3). Apart from the too inquisitive sages, the variety of both matter and style in the body of the text itself raises difficulties. In the first place, besides the usual śloka-s there are verses in āryā metre side by side with prose passages. This prose is written in the style usual to a commentator employing the first-person plural (for the author) while Bharata, from the very beginning, as consistently refers to himself in the first-person singular. Secondly, the *rasa*-s are mentioned now as four, now as eight and again as four original and four derived. Thirdly, the 'original' four viz., the *śṛṅgāra*, the *rau-dra*, the *vīra* and the *bībhatsa* are explained mostly in śloka-s while the other four are explained either in āryā metre or in prose. Similarly Chapter VII opens with an explanatory passage in prose and throughout the chapter we find materials of probably three different texts, as (a) śloka-s, (b) śloka-s quoted under the heading *bhavaṭi cātra ślokaḥ* (to this effect runs a śloka)³ and (c) āryā-s all of which are quoted as *bhavaṭi cātra āryā* etc. This is not the place to suggest any clear-cut theory about the book but one reasonable explanation seems to be that Bharata, traditionally or truly reputed to be the author of a work on drama, must have also written a short treatise on the theory of *Rasa* and that some scholar later on became responsible for handing down the two together. (It is further interesting to note that the topics in Chapter VIII are directly connected with the general discussion in the first five chapters and are in direct continuation of Chapter V. In the latter, the remodelled *pūrva-raṅga*

3. Cf. VII 6-10, 15, 26, 28, 54, etc.

has been described. After that should come the play itself. As said in I 104-118 and XXI 123-5 a play "is an imitational representation, so to say, of the various modes and movements of the people in the matter-of-fact world" This representation, says Bharata, is called *abhinaya* (VIII-7) and thus opens Chapter VIII describing the four different ways i.e. *abhinaya*-s of reproduction and representation. Those four ways are

- (i) *āṅgika*, gesture-acting [Chapters VII-XIV]
- (ii) *vācika*, speech-delivery [XV-XXII]
- (iii) *āhārya*, make-up etc. XXIII, and
- (iv) *sāttvika*,⁴ emotion-display XXIV.

(i) *gesture-acting*

Under this heading are described the various gestures : (a) of head, eyes, brows, lips and neck (VIII); (b) of hands (IX); (c) of chest, waist and hips (X); (d) of feet (XI and XII); (e) of silent acting called *gati* (XIII); and (f) of movements on the stage like exit, entrance etc. (XIV).

(ii) *vācikābhinaya*, *speech-delivery* [XV-XXII]

Under this heading are described

Phonetics (XV 10-33)

Various metres (XV 41-119 and the whole of XVI)

Figures of Speech and Poetics (XVII 44-119)

Sanskrit and Prākṛt dialects with their distribution

(XVIII and XIX)

Ten kinds of dramatic representation (XX).

Treatment of dramatic incidents—*itivyṛtta* (XXI) and,

The form of literary and artistic development—*vyṛtti* (XXII)

No amount of patience or patriotism, much less of reason, would induce anyone to believe that all these passages have a legitimate place in a book on drama. To question their genuineness in the context is not to question their intrinsic value. Besides the text itself is here so clumsy in arrangement. If we want a continuity of thought

4. Note that in VIII-10 the author says that *sāttvika* is already described in VII. It is a mistake. The *sāttvika* in VII is described as a *bhāva* and not as 'abhinaya'. Besides the *sāttvika* referred to as an *abhinaya* is actually described in XXIV-1. 'satve kāryaḥ prayatnas tu'; one should attempt to show feelings and emotions

we shall have to arrange the text as follows. XV 1-9 and 34-40; XVIII 23, 29-35, 44a and 48b; XIX 37ff etc. Thus it will be seen that in addition to a number of verses two entire chapters, XVI and XVIII, could be safely omitted. As a matter of fact the last verse of XVI shows that that chapter concerns a *kāvya-bandha*, poetical work, more than *nāṭya* literature.

In the passages as re-constructed above we have the description and the explanation of *vācīkābhinaya* after which we are led to the ten varieties of drama. It is strange, however, to find that the matter in XX-XXII is included in *vācīkābhinaya* (since the opening verse of XXIII says that now *āhārya abhinaya* is to be described etc.). The information in these three chapters is more for the dramatist than for the actor and yet it is called '*abhinaya*.' It was for this reason that we have interpreted the word '*abhi-naya*' as way or method. Thus the three chapters describing the different methods of the dramatists seem to form the earliest nucleus of a treatise on dramaturgy. The various definitions and metrical explanations in these chapters are repeated almost word to word in the *Daśarūpaka* of Dhanañjaya and the *Sāhitya-Darpaṇa* of Viśwanātha (both works on dramaturgy including poetics). Bharata first enumerates *all the details* (*saṁgraha*), defines *all of them* one by one (*Kārikā*) and then explains them in the same order (*nirukta*). This *saṁgraha-kārikā-nirukta* style of Bharata makes the book difficult to follow in comparison with the style of Dhanañjaya who mentions, defines and explains *one detail* before he goes to the next. In an introductory passage to his work the latter says as much :

'vyākīrṇe manda-buddhīnāṁ jñāte mati-vibhramah

tasya arthas tat-padair eva saṁkṣīpya kriyate 'ñjasa

"As the text is diffused the ignorant are liable to be confused; so I am abridging the original in the very words of the original" (D. R. 1-5). It is clear that the text referred to here is some *nāṭya-śāstra* which, however, has been identified with a *rasa-śāstra* by the commentator who says: *vyākīrṇe vikṣipte viśṛṇe ca rasa-śāstre manda-buddhīnāṁ puruṣāṁ matimohā bhavati, tena tasya nāṭya-vedasya arthas tatpadair eva saṁkṣīpya rjuvṛtṭyā kriyate iti* "As the treatise on *Rasa* is scattered, ill-arranged and exhaustive the ignorant are likely to be confused; therefore the information of the *nāṭya-veda* is presented here abridged in the original words and arranged systematically." From the use of the words *nāṭya-veda* and *rasa-śāstra* it is clear that Bharata's *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as available today,

is being referred to. It is equally clear that neither Dhanañjaya nor his commentator *Dhanika* likes the introduction of *Rasa*-s in a book on dramaturgy.

(iii) *āhāryābhinaya* (XXIII) and (iv) *sāttvika or sāmānyābhinaya* (XXIV)

In XXIII the *āhāryābhinaya* is described. That phrase seems to include the "make-up" of the characters as well as the stage-setting (XXIII-1). In the next chapter, the last i.e. the *sāttvika abhinaya* is described. (The following three chapters—XXV, XXVI and XXVII—describe miscellaneous things like the characteristics of the various characters, the *citrābhinaya* (a more or less insipid repetition of and minor additions to the chapters on *āṅgikābhinaya*) and sundry details like directions to or description of the audience etc.) In the next six chapters the various musical instruments, tunes etc. are described. The only thing to be noted here is the opening of XXVIII in the style of a commentator and in prose, as :—

ātodyavidhim idārīm vyākhyāsyāmaḥ, tad yathā; "now we shall explain the rules on musical instruments" etc.

Once again the different characters (types or standardised ones) with their various functions are described in XXXIV and XXXV. In the last chapter XXXVI—the names of the sages who are asking questions to Bharata are enumerated (a bold and brilliant afterthought !). The *pūrva-raṅga* is once again described and finally the glory of drama, of Bharata and his sons and descendants and heirs and successors is sung. The curtain drops, as if wearily, after a verse in the longest—*śragdharā*—metre and in the fashion of later *bharata-vākyas*. In writing such a long and dragging work perhaps Bharata had improved his poetic capacity enough to write a single verse in the longest metre !

B CRITICISM OF THE INFORMATION IN THE N. S.

From the summary above one thing is clear, that the present *Nāṭyaśāstra*, far from being the earliest, is quite a later composition. The accurate analysis, the copious information and the critical vein (though concealed) presume the earlier existence of numerous plays and numerous attempts to understand them. It is evident that at the time the *Nāṭyaśāstra* assumed its present form Drama had established itself as a popular and a regular feature in social life. What does it matter whether Bharata wrote it or was merely responsible

for it as long as the book holds up Drama to the admiration of the readers and as the only entertainment common to all, irrespective of caste and culture? No wonder then that regular and well-constructed playhouses existed at this time. The book reveals a historical sense in describing the different types of playhouses. In the early days, such shows might have taken place in the open. But, says Bharata, the demons took it into their heads to create disturbances. So it was considered advisable to construct well-guarded places (I. 55-79, II 1-27). On certain occasions, if the Manager or Patron so decided, plays were represented in the open (XIV 64). The time of the day, too, was prescribed for performances. Generally speaking, midnight, noon-time, twilight and meal-times were prohibited (which shows that Bharata had an eye on the business side of Drama!). The actual times were fixed as under⁵ :

(i) A play which is pleasant to the ears and based on tradition⁶ is to be represented during the earlier part of the day (pūrvāhṇa);

(ii) A play wherein the Sattva quality (in acting and in representation) predominates and where there is plenty of instrumental music—is to be staged in the latter part of the day (aparāhṇa);

(iii) A play in the Kaiśikī style dealing with śṛṅgāra rasa and with plenty of music and singing is to be staged early at night (i.e. immediately after sunset); and

(iv) A play of high sentiments, treating mostly the karuṇa rasa is to be staged in the morning.

Attempts have been made to show that this time-allotment is more or less based on scientific and hygienic and psychological considerations. In spite of their ingenuity, these attempts presume too much to convince. As a matter of fact, it appears that the four-fold division above relates to the four different types or styles or vṛttis of drama. The play, referred to in (i) is obviously the bhārati type; that in (ii) is sāttvati more or less; the third is certainly kaiśikī; and the last, if not ārabhaṭī, is one that is different from the first three. We have shown in an earlier place⁷ that the traditional and continuous stages in the evolution of Sanskrit drama were bhārati.

5. XXVII 89-93.

6 Cf. itihāsa mayā sṛṣṭaḥ sa sureṣu nityujjatām (I-19). The very first production is called itihāsa (= tradition).

7. Chap III.

sāttvatī, *kaiśikī* and *ārabhaṭī*. Further we are told in I-17 what each of the four Vedas contributed to the making up of drama. Let us place all this information side by side ;

1. bhāratī	Recitation	Rgveda	pāthya	pūrvāṇha
2. sāttvatī	Recitation with gestures	Sāmaveda	chanting	aparāṇha
3. kaiśikī	Impersonation	Yajurveda	abhinaya	early night
4. ārabhaṭī	Representation	Ātharvaṇa	rasa	early morning

It will be seen from the above that style has more to do with the time of performance. Where there is mere recitation, the earlier part of the day is more suitable both from the reciter's as well as the listener's point of view. Early morning, fresh and energetic, is as suited for emotional acting. Where gesture plays an important part the light of the advanced day (*aparāṇha*) is more convenient. Similarly, for impersonation to be successful (especially with the conveniences of those days) night-time is the best. Bharata, however, prescribes only early night for two reasons : (i) ladies take part in plays of *kaiśikī* style and (ii) the type of the playhouses was not suited for night performances. Nowhere in the text do we read of a roofed playhouse. Under these circumstances night performances were possible—unless a play was staged for the *elite* within the four walls of a well-lit palace or mansion. Bharata, however, mentions with a touch of humour (conscious or unconscious) that he is opposed to night-representations on principle ! Drama, he says, would be the destroyer of sleep (*nāṭyam nidrā-vināśanam*, XXVII 92). Let us only hope that the sage is too sincere to insinuate.

Open or closed, the problems of the playhouse did not seriously affect the staging. A dramatic representation was as desirable as any other ritual and as much, if not more, entertaining. Not only was the drama a divine inspiration drawing from the four holy Vedas but the incidents (*vr̥tta*) and the treatment (*vr̥tti*) in it were equally divine in origin and conception. The very first production *viz.*, the *samavakāra* called "the Churning of Nectar" dealt with the doings of the gods (IV-4). The second show—a *ḍima* variety—dealt with the burning of the Three Walls by God Śiva (IV-11). Further, in the very early stages Śiva himself undertook the task of introducing music and dance in the performance. Similarly, the various *vr̥ttis*,

i.e. the modes of treatment originated from the fight of Divine Lord Acyuta with the demons Madhu and Kaiṭabha (XXII 2ff). It is no wonder that drama, under such auspices, should soon develop into ten varieties, though it is a wonder that no new varieties were introduced by the dramatists or recognised by the critics ever since. Perhaps the later dramatists were less original or the later critics less observant or the sanctity attached to Bharata's name was too solemn to allow any departures. As for Bharata himself, he enumerates and classifies and defines and explains the ten varieties. Incidentally he has pointed out some general features (XXI). Thus any play, in general, has five main ways of knitting (*sandhi*) its incidents. To open with, the story of the play is narrated in outline (*mukha*); the particular incident or incidents that give rise to a dramatic situation should then be introduced (*prati-mukha*); afterwards should be described the situation that heightens the dramatic sense by coming in conflict with or contrast to the preceding incident (*garbha*); a dramatic way should be suggested to steer through this conflict (*avimarśa* or *vimarśa*); and finally the desired end should develop (*nirvahaṇa*). We do admire Bharata for his power of observation and understanding. It will appear, however, that here Bharata has done nothing great except coining some technical words. The five stages of development mentioned above are just the five members of a syllogism in Indian logic. In a logical syllogism there is first the *prati-jñā*, a statement or a sort of enunciation of the thing to be proved. A *hetu* or a logical reason is then stated. Thirdly, there is a *dṛṣṭānta* or analogy which is applied (*nigama*) in the fourth statement to the thing to be proved with the result that the thing is proved (*siddhānta*). Likewise, according to Bharata, the dramatist first summarises the developments in his play (*mukha*), then cites an incident which would bear out such a development (*pratimukha*), gives examples similar or dissimilar (*garbha*), equates the example to the problem in hand (*avimarśa*) and thus arrives at the promised development (*nirvahaṇa*). This logically strict analysis, as will be shown later, was responsible for a series of stereotyped plays. Perhaps Bharata did not realise that art was not logic but magic, that it was not fixed but fresh in form and power.

(C) PRE-BHARATA DRAMAS.

It cannot be supposed that Bharata produced this analysis without any models before him; nor should it be held that from the very

beginning plays were written in Sanskrit with such an artistic treatment. We have already suggested the probable stages of the development of early Sanskrit Drama. A closer study of Bharata's ten varieties of representations supports that suggestion of ours to a great extent. Of the ten varieties four are of the simplest type; not that they are mere short sketches but the mode of treatment in these four—the *aṅka*, the *prahasana*, the *bhāṇa* and the *vīthi*—is elementary. Each of these four has only two of the five *saṁdhi*-s or ways of development viz., the first and the last. That means that none of these is in any way different from mere recitation. Bharata himself adds explicitly that the *aṅka* should have the *bhāratī* or the recitational style* (XX 100). The other three also are probably in the *bhāratī* style.⁸ As an artistic improvement on these four we have the *vyāyoga* and the *īhāmṛga*. These have no *garbha* and *avimarśa* *saṁdhis*. A story is told, an incident represented and the play ends. The *īhāmṛga* deals with heavenly men and women (XX 82) and the *vyāyoga* with a well-known hero and a few female characters (XX 94). Battles are to be represented in both (and probably these battles are described in songs). The *samvakāra* and the *ḍima* are a further improvement. They lack only one *saṁdhi* viz., the *avimarśa*. We have already seen that Bharata mentions these two (IV 4, 11) as the "first" dramatic representations. By "first" it is not meant that they are the earliest of the ten varieties. Before these, there was no "impersonation"—and so probably Bharata does not include them among representational performances. Lastly, we have the *nāṭaka* and the *prakaraṇa*. These two have all the five *saṁdhi*-s. A true-to-life representation (i.e. an attempt for it) might be believed in at this stage. Let us, now, arrange the ten varieties as under :

Source :	Mode :	Varities :	Stage :
R. V	Bhāratī	aṅka, bhāṇa, vīthi, prahasana	1
S V	Sāttvatī	vyāyoga, īhāmṛga	2
Y. V	Kaiśiki	samavakāra, ḍima	3
A. V	Arabhaṭī	nāṭaka, prakaraṇa	4

How does the above arrangement help us to find out the dramatist predecessors of Bharata? The answer to this question will,

under the present circumstances, be more a reasonable guess than a dogmatic decision. With later works on dramaturgy like the D. R. and the S. D. no difficulty arises since their authors or commentators explain their observations with reference to particular plays. No such satisfaction can be had in the N. S. Nevertheless there are situations which are provoking or tempting in this respect. For example, in XIII are described the various gestures to represent certain movements. In XIII 88 we are told how a chariot-rider and a charioteer are to be represented as moving on their ride. In XIII 90 the author tells us how a ride in the sky or atmosphere are to be shown by bodily gestures. In sanskrit plays we are not certain⁹ that a chariot passes through the atmosphere anywhere except in Act VII of Kālidāsa's *Abhijñāna-Śākuntalam* and the first act of Vik. Similarly in XIX Bharata is giving suggestions for the names of certain characters in plays. With reference to the name of a courtesan he suggests,

. dattā mitrā ca senā iti veśyānāmāni kārayet

"The name of a courtesan (should end) in -dattā, -mitrā or -senā." (XIX-33).

Though the first two types of names are common in sanskrit plays both for courtesans as well as court-ladies, the last occurs only in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* of Śūdraka where the courtesan-heroine is named *Vasanta-senā*.⁹ Again if Bharata says that death should not be represented on the stage there is stronger reason to believe that he must have known, and felt what it is to see, death on the stage in a play like the *Urubhaṅga* ascribed to Bhāsa. Whatever that be, we hasten to repeat that this is not strong evidence (perhaps no evidence) to arrive at a conclusion. At the same time, it is undeniable that Bharata did have some 'standard' plays before formulating his rules. We know of no other earlier 'standard' plays than those of Bhāsa, Kālidāsa and Śūdraka. If, however, the author of the N. S. is deliberately concealing such references in order that his book be claimed (and acclaimed) most antiquarian we refuse to be critical and to spoil the humour of the situation. We will bear in our mind, but we shall not mention it aloud, that the author of the available version of the N. S. does know the plays of Bhāsa, of Kālidāsa and of Śūdraka.

9. In the play *Carudatta* ascribed to Bhāsa this character is simply called *nāyikā* (heroine).

CHAPTER XVI

THE PLAYS OF KING ŚRĪ HARṢA

Great writers, as all other great men, rise like the morning sun. They bring with them a freshness of feeling and vigour and vitality. They disperse before them the long accumulated darkness of the past and illuminate beneath them the path of future. And like the morning sun they cast a long shadow wherein the substance is given an appearance of undue prominence. In this respect great writers are a boon and a curse, a boon of life to the world and a curse of stagnation to literature. Prospero keeps Ariel as his prisoner. So does the genius keep the soaring young spirits as its prisoners. It is a great advantage to most modern societies that they are led by mediocrities. A genius that dazzles when seen also blinds in following. The study in the last chapter illustrates the general tendency of accepting great minds as standard for all times. The plays of Kālidāsa and his fore-runners were studied, analysed, and because they were felt as works of unusual merit, were held up as models to be copied. Kālidāsa is not to blame. The very example of a genius breaking down all shackles becomes a new and a stronger shackle to his admirers. Left to himself Kālidāsa would have advised (if he had no better business) any aspiring young writer in such words : "Live and live thy own life ; see, feel and write." But the critics had the advantage of him and said, "see Kālidāsa, feel what *he* describes and repeat what *he* writes" No wonder that for a long time to come the history of Sanskrit as well as of some vernacular literatures is a race in imitating Kālidāsa and his class. In the fore-front of this race is His Majesty King Śrī Harṣa of Kanoj who ruled about 610 A.D.—642 A.D.

Śrī Harṣa is credited with the authorship of three Sanskrit plays—Priyadarśikā, Ratnāvalī and Nāgānandam. It is not of great interest to us whether the king himself or his court poets under their patron's name wrote these plays. Genius makes no pretence to the authorship of these plays, and between the patron-king and his court poets like Bāṇa, the king has decidedly an advantage. He need not have written these plays and still we would have found out the poet in him. His adventures and his accomplishments as a king (and also as

described in the *Harṣa-carita* of Bāṇa) and as a connoisseur reveal a mind keenly susceptible to surroundings. In his life-time he had the privilege of belonging, by turns, to the two great religions of the day viz., Hinduism and Buddhism. His experience was varied and unusual. His father died; his only sister was lost and in searching her his elder brother died; his sister returned, widowed and wedded to Buddhism and left a deep impression on him. When quite a young man he was called upon to rule the kingdom. On his death he left behind him an Empire and three Sanskrit plays.

All the three plays—P. D., Rat. and Nāg.—show one hand through, and one mind behind, them gradually improving in craft and confidence. The two plays—P. D. and Rat.—deal with the story of that popular hero Vatsarāja or Udayana, king of Kauṣāmbī. They are different from one another because their titles differ from one another, and the titles differ from one another because the names of the two heroines differ from one another. Essentially there is no difference between them and no justification for two of them. The superficial difference is due to the passage of time from the writing of the one to the writing of the other. P. D. opens in diffidence, develops into confusion and ends in chaos and convention. As the play opens, King Vatsa has escaped from prison along with Vāsavadattā, his wife. His general has defeated and killed Vindhyakētu in the south and has brought with him Princess Priyadarśikā (heroine) mistaking her for the daughter of the slain adversary. In this disguise the heroine is left in the queen's tutelage. After a time the king sees her. She is now grown up and king Vatsa falls in love with her. Then follows the usual type of court intrigue under Vidūṣaka's auspices. A play written about the King is to be staged. Priyadarśikā is assigned the queen's rôle in the play. And here the real king gets the chance of making love to the heroine (as the play-queen). The intriguer is intrigued. Not interested in the play the Vidūṣaka goes to sleep and babbles out the truth. The queen is angry. Her anger is further incensed because the king has done nothing to save her uncle who has lost his kingdom and liberty. By the time the king asks forgiveness his general returns after successfully saving the queen's uncle and reinstating him. The queen is pleased at this gracious move on the part of her husband and returns it by setting free the so-long-imprisoned heroine. That girl, however, has swallowed poison in despair and is saved only by the magical powers (charms) of the king. It transpires ultimately that the

heroine is no other than the daughter of the queen's uncle. In accordance with an earlier betrothal this love-marriage (?) is brought about by the queen herself.

A similar story with Kālidāsa has lent itself to a lively dramatic treatment in the Mālav. But Harṣa's P. D. is too poor in execution. The whole of Act I is a sort of viṣkarṇbhaka prosaically narrating the background of the play. In Act I the heroine does not appear on the stage at all. Act II is in imitation of Kālidāsa. The heroine goes to the pond and is tormented by the bees as Śakuntalā is and Vatsa, like Duṣyanta, steps forward to her help. When Pṛiyadarśikā is calling for help the Vidūṣaka says :

bhāvati, sakala-pṛthivī-paritrāṇa-samarthana-Vatsarājēna partitrāyamāṇā cetīm indīvarṇkām akrandasi (Lady, you are being protected by Vatsarāja, the strong protector of the whole world, and yet you call upon the maid Indīvarṇkā for help); when Śakuntalā too cries for help (A. Śāk. I) her friends tease her by saying ; ke āvām, paritrātum .. Duṣyantam ākranda rāja-rakṣitavyāni tapovanāni nāma (who are we to protect you? A hermitage is to be protected by the king. Call upon Duṣyanta). The situation in A. Śāk. is more dramatic, more genuine and more enjoyable since Duṣyanta is actually standing there, known to the audience but not seen by the girls. In P. D. not only the audience but the heroine also knows that she is already in the arms of Vatsa. Again, in Act III we have a play within the play. It has proved too much for the young writer. The scene is laid (in the main play) near the pond as the Act opens and then is clumsily shifted to the preksāgāra, the Music Hall of the palace ! As the play-within-the-play proceeds, the Vidūṣaka, like his caste-fellow in the Mālav., goes to sleep and mutters out the truth. The description of the music (III-10) and the speech of the Kañcukin (III-3) are repeated word for word in Nāg. I-14 and IV-1 respectively. In Act IV the hero saves the heroine's life by means of his magical powers. Magical powers are again introduced (though this time the hero is deprived of them) in Rat. IV. As a matter of fact, it appears as if the author wrote the Rat. simply to improve on and remove the defects in the P.D. In the Rat. the heroine sees the hero in Act I as the latter is being worshipped by the queen while the hero and the heroine in the P.D. see each other for the first time in Act II. With only two Acts remaining there is less scope for development in the P. D. while in the Rat. the love-story proceeds briskly from the beginning of Act II.

Nor was the dramatist prepared to write more than four Acts. The story demanded but the conventional rules refused more than four Acts to a *nāṭikā*. So like a street-artist harassed by a policeman, His Majesty Śrī Harṣa packs off his materials with inartistic hurry. Once again in P. D. III the heroine's friend tells the Vidūṣaka that the heroine is in love with the king; and the Vidūṣaka returns the compliment by telling as plainly that the king also is in love with the heroine. This is not even good story-telling, much less a dramatic situation. It will not do for a dramatist to forget that no character can speak to another character (except, in the case of bad acting) without being heard by the audience. Harṣa seems to have found this out since in Rat. II he tries to make an identical situation more dramatic but utilising a *myna* bird. What the heroine tells her friend is heard by the *myna* which repeats it later in the presence of the king. Similarly, the clumsiness of the play-within-the-play of the P. D. is avoided in the Rat. where the heroine, through the cleverness of the Vidūṣaka, is brought in the disguise of the queen herself. For the same purpose of dressing the heroine in the queen's robes the dramatist had to use a play-within-the-play in the P. D. Lastly, Act IV, of the P. D. is a hopeless jumble of events. In a similar situation, in Rat. IV, the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa brings in a magician who sets the palace on fire. Vāsavadattā suddenly remembers that the heroine is fettered and the king immediately rushes to help. The fire was an illusion created by the magician. Otherwise, says Yaugandharāyaṇa, how could the king be brought to the heroine? Apart from that, the incident reveals the nobility of Vāsavadattā and the heroic love of the king for the heroine. In the P. D. two situations are introduced either of which could have brought about the freedom of the imprisoned heroine, the help rendered by the king to her uncle had put the queen in such a gracious mood that she was prepared to set the heroine free. Or, the heroine swallows poison which fact would have equally served the purpose. As it is, the attempted suicide is absurd and superfluous—unless the dramatist was keen to show that his hero was in no way inferior to a snake-charmer! The heroine, however, found out that it was too dangerous to attempt suicide at the end of the play and so, in the Rat., she tries that ruse in Act III. Not only that, the heroine of the Rat. is in the queen's robes while attempting suicide. The King (hero) thinking that the queen herself is committing suicide rushes to her, takes her in his arms, protests his love and lo! the

real queen comes on the stage and detects, what she thinks, a treachery—the second one within a few minutes. This situation adds to the gaiety of the comedy. On the whole, the *Rat.* shows its author as a dramatist of no ordinary talents. The very ideas and situations of the *P. D.* are repeated in the *Rat.* but their exquisite polish in the latter shows not only the boldness but the originality of the artist. The attempt of Harṣa to write successfully within the restricted field of rules of dramaturgy was at last achieved in the *Rat.* Perhaps Harṣa was too good a king to set to his subjects a lesson in revolt by himself flouting the rules of dramaturgy. Nevertheless, he seems to have made a bold attempt to break loose in originality. That attempt was a failure. So after having written *Nāgānanda* in that attempt he reverted to the early methods and rewrote his *Priyadarśikā*; in other words he wrote the *Ratnāvalī*.

Nāgānandam is of course, a play different from both the *Priyadarśikā* and the *Ratnāvalī*. The fact that the *Nāgānandam* deals with a hero who ends as a Buddhist is of no relevance. It is only in the last two Acts that the play takes a Buddhistic tone; in the first three the hero—*Jimūtavāhana*—does not do or say what cannot be done or said by a non-Buddhist. What makes *Nāg.* different from the other two plays is the very basis of dramatic treatment. The two *nāṭikā*-s represent love within the court-life and the palace-walls. In the *Nāg.* love transcends fort-walls and national boundaries. It is love that we have met with in *Kālidāsa*'s plays, especially in the *A. Śāk.* So, as in the latter, the opening scene in *Nāg.* is laid in a hermitage. The two plays run exactly on the same lines, the only difference being that the *A. Śāk.* is conceived by a master-mind. *Jimūtavāhana* enters the hermitage, his right eye throbs (cf. *A. Śāk.* I-14) he meets the heroine and the two fall in love. Love in *Kālidāsa*'s play pours forth 'in profuse strains of unpremeditated art'; in the *Nāg.* it is premeditated since *Gaurī*, her goddess, has told the heroine in a vision of the coming of this stranger lover. *Mitrāvasu*, the heroine's brother, comes to the hero with a proposal on behalf of his sister. *Jimūtavāhana* demurs not knowing that the girl he has fallen in love with and the girl proposed are one and the same. The heroine seeing from cover all these attempts, in a fit of disappointment, attempts suicide. To make matters worse, the hero has just sketched the lady of his heart and *Malayavatī*, the heroine,

does not know that it is herself. Jimūtavāhana rushes to help and saves the girl. Now it is known that the heroine Malayavatī and the sister Mitrāvasū and the girl sketched are all one and the same. The lovers run into each other's arms and by the end of Act III the marriage is celebrated with the sanction of the hero's parents. In Act IV, Jimūtavāhana comes to know of the sad plight of the Nāga-s (snakes) who are murdered in numbers by Garuda, the Celestial Hawk. To avert a total extinction of his race, the King of the Nāga-s makes an arrangement with Garuda to send to the latter each day one nāga to be devoured. The hero, wandering by the sea-shore, is moved by the wailing of a nāga-mother whose son is to be that day's victim. Jimūtavāhana offers himself up in the place of that nāga and is carried away by Garuda. In Act V the old parents and the wife of the hero come to know of his fate and prepare for self-immolation. In the meanwhile Garuda retires with the hero mortally wounded, admires the selflessness and the moral courage of his victim, recognises him as the great Jimūtavāhana and finally relents and promises to stop his murderous activities. In the presence of his family and friends the hero succumbs to his wounds. Immediately the goddess Gaurī appears in answer to Malayavatī's prayer and brings the hero back to life. Garuda on his part fetches nectar from heavens and does more than he has promised by resuscitating all the nāga-s he had killed. Thus the play gets the title of Nāgā-nandam i.e. the *ānanda*, bliss or resuscitation of the Nāgas. Let us imagine the *ānanda* of Harṣa, too, who, in imitation of the great Aśoka after his Kalinga campaign, might have promised, like the Garuda in the play, 'to cease his murderous activities and wars. It would not be fair otherwise.

What was the object of the dramatist in writing this play? It is usually held that Śrī Harṣa wrote it either to extol and preach Buddhism, or that he wrote it when he himself had been converted to Buddhism. The Nāndī, opening verse, is a prayer to Buddha; in the body of the play the Brahmin fool Vidūṣaka is made ridiculous with his sacred thread torn and his ignorance held up to scorn. Such features are quoted in evidence of the Buddhistic tendency of the play. As for the fun poked at the Vidūṣaka we need not be so critical. Even in the apparently 'non-Buddhistic' Priyadarśikā Harṣa makes his hero ridicule the Vidūṣaka in these words; *veda-saṁkhyayā eva āveditam brahmanyam*, "You have proved your Brāhminhood

fall back on a religious excuse. Jīmūtavahana dies on the stage because he is a Bodhisattva.³ He is not bound by the rules formulated by sages of Vedic cult. Thus the play closes as tamely as it opens brilliantly. And now the list of Harṣa's failures included both Priyadarśikā and Nāgānanda. We have shown above how the defects of the P. D. were improved upon in the Rat. Likewise, some of the unsuccessful artifices in the Nāg. are retouched in the Rat. The sketching of one lover (heroine) by the other (hero) in the Nāg. is utilised to better purposes and with greater effect in the Rat. The fooling of the Vidūṣaka in Nāg. III with a bad pun on the word 'vaṃṣ-' (to paint or to describe), the scenes of revelry again in Nāg. III are more picturesquely and more discreetly depicted in Rat. I.

On the whole, it appears that Harṣa was keen to improve. Even in his last play, however, there are serious blemishes. The unnecessary repetition at length of the dialogue between Sāgarikā and Susaṃgatā in Act II through the *myna* bird is an illustration to the point. The king could have known it in any other way less annoying to the audience. Besides, a monkey has to be introduced, let loose to bring about such a situation. What a monkey to upset and frighten the whole palace! True, Kālidāsa also lets a monkey loose in his Mālavikāgnimitram, but, it does not develop such frightful and fanciful consequences. This is one of the major defects of Śrī Harṣa as a dramatist. His art knows no economy.

The real trouble with Harṣa was that he was least qualified to be a dramatist. A knowledge, however thorough, of all the rules of dramaturgy is not in itself sufficient to write a good play. Śrī Harṣa, like most of the Sanskrit dramatists, borrows the story from an earlier source. But when it comes to re-telling it in a dramatic form he fails. His characters are mostly story-tellers and as such we are not interested in what happens to them. Even in three or four principal characters there is no life at all. Either they are dummies stuffed in the traditional form or they are the mouthpieces of the poetic author. We know beforehand what his characters are going to say and what we do not know would be irrelevant lyrical outburst. His Vidūṣaka, for example, has no individuality. He is not as naturally a fool or as naturally a scoundrel as he should have been. On all occasions where

3. Note the word 'bodhisattva' used only once in the play and that too when the hero is dead (vyāpāditaḥ).

he makes a fool of himself you can hear the author prompting and pushing behind. Similarly, except in the *Ratrāvalī* to some degree, the heroines of *Harṣa* are dull automata who submit to destiny in a ritualistic manner, submit to their lover in a conventional manner, and are married at last more out of pity for their helplessness than in the name of true love. With such a *Vidūṣaka* as his friend and such a heroine as his beloved the hero cannot but be a school-master; only he is more temperamental since he lives amidst luxury and beauty. From a corner of a stage, he declaims (i.e. dictates to the school-boys) poetic description of the scene, of the heroine, of sunrise and sunset *at the end of Act I or II or III*. To take an example, the whole of *Rat. I* is poetry, pure and simple. Of the eighteen long verses in the main scene no less than thirteen are sung by the king. He describes the festivities (5 verses), his queen (4 verses), and the evening (2 verses). The fact that Śrī *Harṣa* now and then rises to great poetic heights does not mitigate his defects as a dramatist. Whenever *Harṣa* finds that the play is not moving in action he hustles in characters like so many errand-boys and hushes them out with as much lack of tact and grace. Thus, to take an instance, in *Nāg. IV*, the hero is wandering along on the beach. He wonders what the mounds are. He pushes in *Mitrāvasu* to say that those mounds are not the Malaya ranges but heaps of *nāgas'* (snakes) bones. Then he explains the fate of the *nāgas*. No sooner is this information given (to the audience) than a messenger comes to say that *Mitrāvasu* is urgently wanted by his father. Why? Let the servant himself answer; *pratihārah* :—(*kārpe*) *evam evam* "Attendant :— (whispers) so-and-so. In other words, *Mitrāvasu* is packed off by the dramatist.

It is needless to add examples. The only marvel is how such a fine poet turned out to be such a poor dramatist. As a patron, he might have been pampered by the court-pundits; as a king, His Majesty might have less scope for insight and observation. But this is not all. What is more to the point is the artificiality of Śrī *Harṣa's* dramas. He wrote plays, we are almost compelled to say, not because he wanted or felt to study the various aspects of life. Poetry to him was an accomplishment and not an urge; Drama with him was a product not of life but of learning—learning the rules on dramaturgy. *Bharata* says that his first performance was given on the occasion of *Indra festival* (*N.S. I 56*). So *Harṣa's Nāgānandam* is staged, as is said in the prologue, on *Indra festival day*. Similarly,

a nāṭikā, treated in Śṅgāra rasa, could be staged only at spring time, so the P D and the Rat. are staged on the occasion of the Spring festival. It is for this reason that Śrī Harṣa mentions in his prologues four requisites for a successful performance, viz, (i) a clever poet, (ii) an appreciative audience, (iii) skilled actors and (iv) a popular story. Though it is gratifying to note that Harṣa takes only 25 p.c credit for himself, it was an ill day that handed over one of the most popular forms of literature into the hands of a king. The rule of law and order was transferred to the realm of literature. Who knows if Harṣa did not employ some pedants to formulate new rules with reference to his plays alone and did not thus give his royal sanction by writing in the decaying Sanskrit language to the banishment of intellectual democrats and artistic anarchists?⁴

4 Unfortunately we have Dhanika the commentator of Dhananjanaya's Daśarupaka, quoting and illustrating mostly from Śrī Harṣa's plays

CHAPTER XVII

A REVIVAL

(*Viśākhādatta and Bhavabhūti*)

We saw in the last chapter that with King Śrī Harṣa, Sanskrit drama assumed a definite form and was already on its way to standardisation. The increasing distance between the written Sanskrit and its spoken dialects and the literary fashion set by such a powerful king turned Sanskrit drama into an intellectual luxury. We might even go further and say that immediately after Harṣa play-writing was placed on the curriculum of a poet's degree. We might imagine, on the analogy of the restoration period in England, a plethora of plays—small plays by small writers. Most probably the same theme viz., the love-affairs of a king satisfied the poetic fancies of each and every writer. At a time when play-writing is a literary fashion a poet as well as a philosopher or a grammarian can legitimately be expected to write a play. The result is inevitable. Drama ceases to be what it should be, both functionally and technically. That such was the case could be seen from the strong protests of two great dramatists after Harṣa. Viśākhādatta, the author of *Mudrā-Rākṣasa*, speaks of plays of bad writers which begin one way and end quite in another one. (*kukavi-kṛta-nāṭakasya iva anyanmukhē anyannirvahane*). He is sick of pedants writing or taking interest in drama. In the prologue he tells us that he is writing his play for an audience that is particularly appreciative of (this branch of) literature (*kāvya-viśeṣa-vēdīnyam paṇṣaḍi prayujjānasya*). He himself has studied drama in all its aspects. In a splendid passage (IV. 3) he compares a dramatist to a statesman. Both are capable of working on slender materials, or developing the same concealing at the same time the possibilities, and of keeping that development throughout under their control even as they raise therein intellectual problems. To write a drama you must be a dramatist first and last—thundered the other writer viz. Bhavabhūti, the author of three plays the *Mahāvīra-carita*, the *Mālatī-Mādhava*, and the *Uttara-Rāma-carita*. "You have studied the Vedas, the Upaniṣadas, Śāmkhya

and Yoga lores? Yes? You think you are clever, don't you? But know that all your learning is of no use for play-writing. The powers of a good dramatist lie in his close observation, in his subtle and succinct style and in clever presentation." (MM. I 10). So he says of Mālatī-Mādhava, his social play, that the sentiments therein are depicted in all their subtlety, actions charming and reasonable and that though a love-story it has sense and dignity, and an unusual plot developed in a skilful dialogue. (MM. 16) Bhavabhūti has correctly sensed the defects of earlier plays dealing with stupid, stereotyped and undignified love-plots in dull and unnatural accents. He reports his audience as tired of sickly love-stories. "Let us have a play depicting the heroic sentiments of cultured minds, a clash of characters and the subtleties thereof." This is their request to the stage-manager of the Mahāvīra-carita (I 2, 3).

From still another point of view these two dramatists seem to protest against Śrī Harṣa's type of play. From its very origin, as well as in the hands of playwrights like Kālidāsa and Sūdraka, drama was a product of contemporary social soil and surroundings. In popularising the Nāṭikā form, Śrī Harṣa introduced a style of romance that refused to face realities and persisted in following fancies. To Viśākhadatta and Bhavabhūti drama was essentially a social study, a presentation of the ways of the world—of *lokacarita*. So we find Viśākhadatta writing against a historical background while Bhavabhūti takes most of his plots from the epic Rāmāyaṇa since it conformed, more than the Mahābhārata, to the Hindu type of family, and other social institutions. It is true their stories are old but entirely new is the way in which they are told. Drama, with these two writers, is once again a presentation of life as they saw and of the life that they saw. It is for this reason that the Cāṇakya in the MR. is not the traditional Cāṇakya, a self-seeking adventurer. In the play he is a constructive statesman whose one ambition is to place his country under a strong and uniform central authority. Viśākhadatta, a member of the ruling class, had not lived in vain at a time when his country was divided under petty and narrow-minded princes whose one business was to fight with the neighbour. "This country did never feel secure as long as the Nandas were ruling. Now it has been united under one sovereignty"—these words of Cāṇakya (I-22) are a cry from the poet's heart. In the very last verse of the play the author notes with agony his country preyed upon by the foreign-

ers (mlecchair udvejjamāna).¹ "Let me not lose my intellectual powers which, to achieve an object, are far more efficacious than hosts of armies" (I, 26). In this sentiment of Cāṇakya the dramatist is asking for a sound statesman in preference to a sound killer, otherwise known as a great conqueror or warrior. These warrior-kings with their hosts of armies, emulating the code of another time, had done their worst by fights and factions. Times are changed now. The rule of the country must be reflected not in the gory sword but in the feeling intellect of the ruler. Even the old rule that a Brahmin should counsel and a Kṣatriya should fight is no longer relevant. The professional Brahmin Cāṇakya is throughout the play earnestly seeking to win over Amātya Rākṣasa before making him the king's minister. In the very first speech Cāṇakya makes it clear. (ata eva asmākam tvatsamgrahane yatnaḥ) "That is why we are trying to win you over."

Far bolder than those of Viśākhadatta are the changes and the adaptations that Bhavabhūti introduced in the episodes he selected from the epic. Of his three plays, two viz., the Mahāvīra-Carita and the Uttara Rāma-Carita are based on the Rāma story. Between themselves the two plays cover the life-story of Rāma from his education and marriage upto his second re-union with Sītā. (It roughly extends over 26 years, 14 in the Mahā. and 12 in the U.R.). The poet's object is evident throughout. He attempts to interpret the life and actions of Rāma—unavoidably in the light of his own society and surroundings. The struggle between Rāma and Rāvaṇa—the core of the epic story—is a fight for supremacy as Bhavabhūti sees it in the Mahāvīra-Carita. Rāma as an ideal king is compelled to challenge Rāvaṇa, a powerful tyrant. The rākṣasas of the play are not the fantastic evil spirits of mythology. They are, one and all, well-behaved, human and reasonable in a way. Thus Mālyavān, the uncle of Rāvaṇa, is planning to get Paraśurāma, a Brahmin and an inveterate hater of Kṣatriyas, against Rāma. Here, as well as in Act IV, Mālyavān is a statesman who has a policy and a diplomacy. When the defeated Paraśurāma retires into the forest leaving the Daṇḍaka territory under Rāma's supervision, Mālyavān des-

1. This sentiment would not be as true of the times of Cāṇakya as of after the downfall of the Mauryan (but more especially of the Gupta) Empire. The author thus refers more probably to contemporary conditions.

patches Śūrpanakhā disguised as Mantharā, the hump-backed maid of Kaikēyi. Śūrpanakhā goes to Mithilā and asks Daśaratha for two boons he had promised to his favourite queen Kaikēyi; one, that Bharata should be crowned heir-apparent to the throne; two, that Rāma should go in exile for 14 years with Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa. In the epic the above episode takes place in the palace of Ayodhyā where Mantharā instigates and then Kaikēyi asks. Bhavabhūti, however, has laid the scene at Mithilā and has entirely exonerated Kaikēyi from the sordid piece of cruelty and hatred by making Mālyavān and Śūrpanakhā responsible for the whole affair.

The episode of Rāma's marriage too is described in an original way. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa led by Viśvāmitra arrive at Mithilā where Janaka's brother accompanied by Sītā and Ūrmilā receives them. Rāma and Sītā fall in love at first sight. The marriage is practically settled. The ordeal of breaking Śiva's bow in twain is then gone through, as if formally. As a matter of fact, the breaking of this bow is made significant from an entirely different point of view (though in the epic it is a necessary preliminary to the marriage). Paraśurāma, a powerful Brahmin, feels personally humiliated and challenged since Śiva is his tutor. In Acts II and III the poet analyses the character of Paraśurāma in a masterly way. Should the Brahmins degrade themselves by taking, as Paraśurāma did, to the cruel profession of fighting? Was Paraśurāma justified in his efforts to exterminate the Kṣatriya race? Paraśurāma himself answered these questions after his defeat and humiliation in Act IV. "It was not in the least wise of me to behave as I did. My name and fame and family have been sullied by me alone. I had many faults in me; and yet you forgave me with a Brahmin's kindness. I have been defeated for my own arrogance and for my own good." (IV 22). Bhavabhūti himself was a good Brahmin of the South, which only shows that he was a better dramatist.

In being a better dramatist Bhavabhūti has a claim more to our sympathy than to our admiration. Like all original thinkers and great artists, he seems to have been misunderstood, even ridiculed by his contemporaries. Literature and art are the only phases of life where democracy is a positive curse. The contemporaries of Bhavabhūti had their own ideals about drama—like the muddled-headed middle-class of all ages. Moreover, plays like those of king Śrī Haṛṣa had convinced them in their belief that drama, at its best, was a luxury and a pleasantry. Love to them was mere lasciviousness.

When a Viśākhadatta¹ writes about a prosaic Brahmin and when a Bhavabhūti writes like a prosaic Brahmin where is drama going to? —they asked half in contempt and half in humiliation. Worse than that. Bhavabhūti's manner is positively insulting when he writes of love as,

advaitam sukṣa-duḥkhayōr anugunam sarvāsu avasthāsu yad
viśrāmo hṛdayasya yatra jarasā yasminn ahāryō rasah
kālēna āvaraṇātyayāt parṃate yat snehasāre sthītam
bhadram prēma sumānuṣasya katham apy ēkam hi tat prāpyate.

“Uniform in happiness and misery, equable in all conditions, the content of heart where feeling intensifies with age, and as time goes by ripens into friendship; such is love. Lucky is the man who for once is destined for such love.” (U.R. I-39) No wonder that the populace turned down Bhavabhūti's plays and philosophy; and no wonder, too, that Bhavabhūti, in one of his most wretched moods, cursed it in such dignified accents:

yē nāma kēcid iha naḥ prathayanty avajñām
jānanti tē kiṃ-api tām prati na ēsa yatnaḥ
utpatsyātē mama tu ko 'pi samāna-dharmā
kālo hy ayam niravadhīr vipulā ca pṛthvī

“There are some who (TRY TO) treat us with contempt. Well, our plays are not meant for them. What do they know (of drama)? There shall be born one (intellectually) our equal. There *shall* be; for, Time is endless and Earth a vast place” (MM. 1-8). Small consolation indeed for so great a writer! In fact, the whole of *Mālati-Mādhava* seems to have been written in this mood. The play differs from the other two only in the fact of not being drawn from a mythological source; otherwise, the same richness of thought, the same powerful treatment, the same high thinking and accurate analysis obtain here as in the other two plays.

Mālati-Mādhava is a play that centres round a love-affair. Unlike in the earlier love-plays the hero and the heroine in the MM. belong to non-princely families. Secondly, the hero and the heroine are both young and suited to each other while in earlier plays the hero, usually a king, is already a mature and married man of experience and the heroine a girl from about 16 to 18 and, of course, never married before. Throughout Act I, the dramatist is pointing out that a genuine love-story is a most natural thing (I 16, 18, 20,

23, 27 and 35). He insists on this point because the love of a king and a princess in the *Harṣa* type of plays is, according to him, like the love between the circus manager and the animal in the cage. The princess heroine is always confined to the four walls of the palace—especially that part of the palace which is within an easy reach from the harem. Mādhava and Mālātī, however, are free enough to mix with the outside world; and even in this wider world, both have found each other and have also found out that each could not live without the other. In spite of this spontaneous and mutual call, the lovers could not be brought together owing to the prevailing social conditions and conventions; nor is there any court-fool of a Vidūṣaka as in love-stories of kings, to arrange clandestine meeting. Bhavabhūti could never tolerate the traditional, standardised fool to walk in the noble avenues of love. He has introduced a Buddhist nun—Kāmaṇḍakī by name—who, to superficial observers, appears as a go-between. When her disciple wonders why Kāmaṇḍakī who has renounced the worldly ties should interest herself in a love-intrigue the latter replies that it is only on account of her love for her friend Bhūrīvasu, Mālātī's father (I-12) and secondly, because the mutual love of Mādhava and Mālātī is an open secret. Under such circumstances, she adds, it is just a credit to those who would bring about the marriage (I 16). Kāmaṇḍakī is a lady of great experience and learning and of a healthy outlook. "The only important and auspicious circumstance for a marriage is mutual love" (*itaretarānurāgo hi vivāha-karmaṇi parārdhyam* II p. 59). Thus she speaks to her disciple Avalokitā. To Mālātī herself she narrates the stories of Śakuntalā and others suggesting that even in the sacred past decent girls have been bold enough—against all difficulties—to marry only those they loved (III 3). Thus training the lovers in their responsibilities, guiding them along a straight-forward path and arranging meetings between them so that they could know and understand each other more closely; Kāmaṇḍakī makes bold to marry them at the time when Mālātī, as the bride-to-be of Nandana, comes in bridal procession to the temple. "To a wife her husband is a lover, a friend, all her relations, all her desires, her treasure, nay, her very life; to a husband, his wife is his rightful consort. Remember this, my dears" (VI 18) is her advice to the young lovers as they are being married in haste and secret. The story of Mādhava and Mālātī ends with Act VI. In Act VII Makaranda—Mādhava's friend—has returned to the procession disguised as Mālātī and is

married to Nandana. The boy-Mālati did not take long to give a good shaking to Nandana. Madayantikā, the sister of the bridegroom and Mālati's friend and the beloved of Makaranda comes to pacify her friend and sister-in-law and not till she embraces the latter does she find that her sister-in-law is really her lover. Madayantikā compliments her friend by eloping with Makaranda. The story in the last three Acts is in spite of some of the best poetry in them, an unnecessary tag. In Act VIII one Kapālakunḍalā carries away Mālati in order to humiliate Mādhava who had killed her preceptor Aghōraghaṇṭa. Act IX is only a lyrical imitation of Mēghadūta; and the last Act where the elders set the seal of approval on the conduct of Mādhava and Makaranda is more conventional than artistic. It is greatly interesting to note that the commentary of Tripurari is available only upto first seven Acts though in his commentary on I 5 he seems to refer to Act VIII.²

(Though Bhavabhūti seems to have written the play for an average audience there is no compromise with his artistic conceptions. He has treated love from a higher point of view. He has introduced a world of realities. Act V is a terrible scene laid in a temple in the crematorium. Act VI is the temple in the town. If in Act V Mālati is to be sacrificed by Kapālakunḍalā, in act VI she is to be sacrificed by her own people. It is a clever trick on the part of the poet to place the two temples side by side and challenge his audience. Act VII represents a bed-room; Act VIII is by the side of a pond.

In basing their plays thus closely on contemporary life both Viśakhadatta and Bhavabhūti have adopted a new style and a new technique. The lengthy soliloquies of Cāṇakya (MR. I) and Rākṣasa (MR. II), Mādhava's narration of how he fell in love at first sight (MM. III), Lavaṅgikā's description of Mālati's state of mind (MM. III) are some of the best illustrations. The authors are more justified in this since they introduce fine dramatic dialogues. The scene of the feigned quarrel between Cāṇakya and Candragupta (MR. III), the meeting of Rāma and Paraśurāma (Mahā. II), the quarrel between Paraśurāma and the sages (Mahā. III), the fight of

2. bhadram bhadram iti Mālati-Madayantikā-prāpti-rūpam maṅgala-dvayam śūcitam Bhūyaḥ maṅgalīya iti Kapālakunḍalā-grhīta-mālati vipanna-nīṭarah. arakṣāṅkīṭa mādhaba-makaranda-prēṇa-rakṣādayaḥ sūcyaṇte.

Mādhava and Aghoraghāṇṭa (MM. V), Rāma's talk with Vāsantī (U. R. III)—in such scenes the dramatists have shown a great skill in weaving a dialogue in pithy and powerful prose. The plays of Śrī Harṣa present a poor contrast in this respect. As has been already shown Śrī Harṣa was more a poet of imagination and description than a dramatist of insight, observation and analysis. His plays are lyrics first and stories at the best. Viśākhadatta, on the other hand, has subordinated—even suppressed oftentimes—pure fanciful poetry to genuine dramatic value. Only once (MR. III) do we find a long, lyrical passage but then the Kaumudī festival is to be celebrated. Similarly, Bhavabhūti describes Daṇḍaka and Pañcavatī (U. R. II and III) and it is appropriate since those sights are reviving memories painful to Rāma and helpful to the development of the play. The crematorium (MM. V) is described at length for the probable reason that it could not be represented on the stage.

Far more important than either the prose style or the presentation of the contemporary life or even the high tone of accurate and economical observation and analysis is the new technique evolved by these two dramatists and to that we shall now turn.)

CHAPTER XVIII

THE NEW TOUCH

(The success or otherwise of a drama which, as Kālidāsa has said, is prayōga-pradhāna, i.e. mainly to be represented on the stage, depends on the success or otherwise of the illusion of the audience. With the modern stage and the elaborate facilities for its setting (not, of course, in India) it is much easier for the producer and the actors to make the audience live and move in the very atmosphere of the play. Nevertheless, a good dramatist, with or without such facilities, is able to create that atmosphere by his artistic ability. For one thing, a good dramatist, when and as long as he writes his play, is himself living the days and thoughts and actions of his characters. In all seriousness and with great significance Bhavabhūti's Sūtradhāra in the U. R. says :

eṣōsmi, bhōh, kavivaśīt kāryavaśāc ca
āyōdhukas tadānūntanaś ca samvṛttah

"Here I turn into a citizen of Ayōdhyā of Rāma's days, since the poet and the plot require me to."

Mere directions or descriptions, however, are not enough to create and sustain such an illusion on the part of an audience. The power of the dramatist which does create and sustain such an illusion is the 'dramatic touch.' Sometimes it is the background, sometimes the description, and sometimes the scene or the sentiment or the characterization that creates such an illusion. The entrance and the opening speech of Cāṇakya, for example, in MR. I is a case where a scene helps to create the illusion. The Sūtradhāra in the Prologue is speaking of the eclipse of the moon. The way he expresses it there is a pun on the word *candra*—'moon' and *grahana*—'eclipse' or 'capturing' (I. 6). Suddenly from behind the curtain pours the thundering voice of Cāṇakya 'who dares to lay his hands on Chandragupta as long as I am alive?' (āh ka eṣa mayi sthitē chandraguptaṁ abhūbhavitum icchati). It is the suddenness that wakes the audience into a new atmosphere and by the time Cāṇakya enters and talks in detail about his policy and actions we have so far forgotten the Sūtradhāra and formed a new and intimate ac-

quaintance with this diplomat that we listen, with a sense of self-importance, to the secrets of his policy. Before this illusion would be lost a spy of Cāṇakya enters as a gypsy showing round the pictorial charts of Yama and his world. In other words, the scene is such that we would never feel aloof from it and by the time Act I is over we are involved in such an interesting and intricate cob-web of plots and policies that we decide to go through the experience.¹ In Act II Rākṣasa is introduced; his spy enters; and, poor Rākṣasa, he has forgotten all about his own spy and cannot even recognise him! With our experience of the astuteness and of the admirable coolness of Cāṇakya in Act I we cannot but pity the poor Rākṣasa. Thus as the play proceeds we are more and more taken into its atmosphere, feeling and suffering and thinking and acting with its characters so that when we rise we are refreshed as if from a healthy sort of exercise.

A most elegant example in this respect is the Uttara-Rāma-carita of Bhavabhūti. Herein we find both the skill of the head and the touch of the hand. The story in the U. R. is too well-known from the epic to be introduced. In the Mahā., on the other hand, though based on the same popular story, the Actor asks the Manager in the Prologue what part of the story is to be dramatized since such a venture (viz., a dramatic version of the epic Rāmāyaṇa) is so unusual.² (*kin tu apūrvatvāt prabandhasya kathā-pradēśam samārambhē śrōtum icchanti*, p. 9.) In the U. R. from the title itself we know that Rāma's later life is to be depicted. It is Rāma-carita—the story of Rāma and Rāma alone. That the dramatist should succeed, as ultimately he did in throwing such popular characters as Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa in the background is a marvel of his art. How is it done? Before we answer this question we shall try to understand the story as the dramatist has presented it. After all, the success or otherwise depends on how far the achievement accords to the intention.

In the first place, we should remember that the poet wants to interpret and not to narrate the life of Rāma. To a Hindu whose family-institution is ruled by the father and embraces his own as well as his father's brothers the character of Rāma is ideally admir-

1. This statement can be verified by imagining the entrance of Cāṇakya in any other way; the pun is as sudden and as suggestive.

2. Since the days of Bhāsa there were practically no plays based on the epic stories (to be distinguished from the stories in the epics). Even with Bhāsa the Mahābhārata was more popular than the Rāmāyaṇa.

able ; to a Hindu who, from times immemorial, has been legally allowed to marry as many wives as he likes, the fact that Rāma—a prince—should live with and love only one wife is a marvel ; that Rāma should suffer and struggle for others is an inspiration indeed. It is not then surprising that a poet, a man with vision and feelings, should strive to understand and analyse and interpret such an ideal character. How is it possible that Rāma could cast off his wife whom he loved and knew to be chaste on a petty pretext that the irresponsible mob had raised a scandal against her ? Kālidāsa treated this intriguing problem in his *Raghuvaṃśa* (cantos XIV-XV) but Bhavabhūti was bolder enough to do the same in a drama which is known as *drśya kāvya* i.e. poem to be seen.

Bhavabhūti has set about his task through a thorough analysis of the characters. From the original epic he has borrowed just the fact that Rāma abandoned Sītā and then, all on his own, he has constructed a fine background and a series of avenues so that our approach to the problem be the easier. In Act I, Rāma is the happiest young man to begin with. His enemies are all killed or defeated ; his exile is over and safe ; and his wife is bearing his issue. His one ambition now is to be a successful ruler.

sneham dayām ca saukhyam ca yadī va jānakīm api
arāadhanāya lokasya muñcato nāsti me vyathā (I-12).

“I want to serve my subjects and please them., For that (if necessary) I would give up, with no grievance, love and compassion and happiness—nay, even my beloved Sītā I would give up.”

Of course, nobody takes the remark seriously except in its sort of mathematical suggestion that Sītā is more than any happiness to him. Many another young man, in these circumstances, would rise to the same eloquence of heart. But before the act is over, *Rāma does abandon Sītā!* This is carrying one's ideals too far, we shake our head in mild disapproval. Is Rāma, because of his prosaic sense of duty, turned so hard-hearted ? Is Rāma so unchivalrous as to throw his pregnant wife helpless in the midst of wild forests ? Is Rāma so sensitive to a fair name ? So scared of his subjects ? Such are our thoughts when we feel determined to understand the strange ways of this man.

Bhavabhūti himself has taken care that our views—the views of average mind—are well and truly represented. As soon as Rāma

decides to abandon Sītā, Durmukha—the spy—comes out, as an official, with a contempt for the rabble.

katham, agni-parisuddhāyāḥ garbha-sthita-pavitra-
santārāyāḥ devyāḥ *durjana*-vacanād idam vyavasthitam
devena.

"Our Queen has gone through the fire (ordeal) and proved her faith; she bears in her womb a holy offspring; my lord, what are you doing by believing in foul-mouthed rascals?" (I).

"May heavens protect thee if thou thinkest my subjects wicked! How could they believe in the fire-ordeal that took place at such a distance?" moans Rāma. What a noble attempt to understand others' point of view! But is there no other way of convincing the people except this extreme cruelty of casting her off? So kind and sympathetic to his citizens, how could Rāma be so unkind to his own wife in a delicate condition? Strange are the ways of these great men, we exclaim with Vāsantī in Act II. "Harder than diamond yet more tender than a flower is the heart of the great. Who can understand it?" (II. 7) In order to maintain the name and fame of his family Rāma became so hard-hearted. Is this self-sacrifice? We doubt it again with Vāsantī who says, "Oh, you are hard-hearted! Do you think your fame that you place higher than all is (now) unsullied? What is more disgraceful, more infamous than throwing a helpless woman into a dreadful danger?" (III. 27) It is not merely the outsiders that condemn Rāma. Even his own father-in-law, Janaka, known to tradition as a great philosopher, condemns him in Act IV. "Oh, the heartlessness of the citizens! The thoughtlessness of Rāma! I am boiling with rage at this iniquity. There is only one way in which I could be satisfied and that is either by an arrow (i.e. killing Rāma) or by a curse." (IV. 25) The people nearer at home, too, are not at all pleased if not actually displeased with Rāma's action. "The very seed of all our desires has been first removed by Fate; when the plant is cut off how could there be a flower?" says Sumantra—the old charioteer—who has seen three generations of Rāma's family. "When the eldest of the family has no issue where is the greatness or the continuity? With this thought our elders are greatly disturbed." Says Chandrakētu, Lakṣmaṇa's son (V. 25). This is more a technical than an ethical condemnation of Rāma. Even Lava and Kuśa—Rāma's own sons but as yet unidentified—punish Rāma by pitying him. "Without his

Sītā could Rāma be anything but miserable?" is the comment of Kuśa, the elder of the twins. (VI. 30). In the last Act, Mother Earth too is angry. When Sītā says "oh, my lord, my husband" Earth turns angrily on her daughter and shouts with bitterness "who is your lord, your husband?"

Thus does Bhavabhūti represent criticisms and condemnations of all shades. It is natural, he argues, that none could understand, much less sympathise with Rāma. In his own analysis of Rāma, he tells us that to say Rāma is great or cruel or thoughtless etc. is not to understand the problem at all. Rāma, as Bhavabhūti sees him, is human to the very marrow of his bones. "Who could purify my Sītā who is pure from her very birth? Fire and holy water need no purification" (I. 13), says Rāma before he has heard of the scandal; and after he comes to know it, he curses himself as a cruel, wicked man not deserving Sītā who is sleeping (at the moment) on his laps. Slowly he gets up. In words, he decides to send her away; in action, he himself is running away—but not before he falls at her feet and cries "For the last time let your lotus-feet touch Rāma's head." And then—he b-u-r-s-t-s into s-o-b-s! He still loves her! The course of true love always runs smooth, i.e. unperturbed by such external or material considerations. The love that unites two hearts has its own purpose to achieve viz., to take those two hearts to a vaster world of vital feelings; to turn the individual from the human speck he is to a divine spark enlivening all it comes in contact with. "Children are the (holy) tie that brings two loving hearts to a world of joy" (III. 17). Great or small, that is the noble purpose to which a loving heart is raised. So, it is no weakness on Rāma's part when he breaks out saying "I am alone, I am helpless in this forest; I will cry out to my heart's fill. Citizens of mine that are in Ayodhyā, will you excuse me for once?" (III. 32). "This inner emotion, this affectionate tie of children is universal" says the Ganges when even Mother Earth turns her maternal look to her daughter. What he says in Act III Bhavabhūti makes Vālmīki say in Act VII in the latter's (imaginary) dramatisation of the epic. We know for certain that Vālmīki never dramatized his Rāmāyana. Kālidāsa tells us that Kuśa and Lava recited the epic in Rāma's presence. (Raghu. XV. 63). This not the only innovation of Bhavabhūti. To convey the effect he wants, he has not only introduced a new situation but an entirely new atmosphere in which the audience enters from the very beginning and, with the knowledge it

already has of the epic story, enjoys these fresh excursions into the world of noble feelings.

As the play opens, the Sūtradhāra tells us that it is the festival of Rāma's coronation; and yet he wonders why the officers and the royal servants are, one and all, so quiet! How is it that the city, instead of being gay at the festivity, is all glum and gloomy? The public squares are absolutely deserted! We too soon begin to wonder what is wrong. Perhaps, as we know the story, we fear that Sītā has been already abandoned. Our fears are set at rest by the Actor's information that all the visitors have left Ayodhyā. Rāma's mothers too have left under Vasiṣṭha's escort, for Rṣyasṛṅgā's hermitage where sacrificial sessions lasting for 12 years, are to be started. What a pity that Rāma, after his happy return, should not be able to enjoy the company of his people—for possibly another 12

years. The only person left in the city is Sītā with child. It is only now we could need the help and advice and

of the elders. No wonder then that the new king might be feeling so the manager (Sūtradhāra) de- with an idea of entertaining the the etiquette of our profession'). to be very careful in their use of). "You cannot be too careful says the Manager, "people will ." "That reminds me," whispers are talking scandal even against ā? They don't believe the fire- ūtradhāra who says "God help way to Rāma!" What a tragedy nly companion is Sītā, when he sue! With this knowledge and nain scene opens, to sympathise say; and we pity Sītā for her

feel as if we are in a maze of and as we look back we find

still. Against the background of Sūtradhāra's suggestion, the attempts of Rāma and Sītā to cheer each other convey a sinister impression to our mind. "Separation from relatives is always distressing," says Sītā, and Rāma, just to cheer

AL 20
DIARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN
(MUNSHI SARASWATI NANDINI GRANTHAGAR)
CHOWPATRY, BOMBAY 7

S. No. 43280

Date: 1/1/1967

Received with thanks from Shri/Smt. D. C.

Pharaphesha

M. No. 442 Class II the sum of

Rs. Twelve Price

On Account of Fine/Penalty/Rules Rs. P.

Jan-Meet Fee Rs. 12 P.

Admission Fee Rs. P.

Rs. 12 P.

says to Sītā (I-18). "Gone are the days when our father was living, when I was newly wed and when our mothers used to look after us." (I-19). Why, even the days of exile were happy! "Do you remember, my dear, the time when Lakṣmaṇa used to look after us? Do you remember how we used to enjoy ourselves on the beautiful banks of Godāvāri? Do you remember how cheek-to-cheek and arm-in-arm we used to talk away the whole night? Do you remem—" (I-27). Poor Rāma! the heart that yearns for the past has surely its reasons to rue the present. The more they think of the past, the wider is the gulf between the happy past and the miserable present. They feel like children lost in the wilderness whiling away their fears by thinking of mother's arms; like lonely wanderers lost in a stormy night. Sītā shudders. "The gloom has so covered me up that I feel as if I am again separated from my husband" (aham api atibhūmirṇ gatēna raṇarāṇakēna ārya-putra-śūnyam iva ātmānaṣ paśyāmi. p. 33). It *does* get unbearable. The misery is not only revived but intensified so much so that Rāma cries out "Stop. Lakṣmaṇa, I feel as if I am once again separated from my Sītā" (I-33). Feels as if! Once again we see the approaching shadow of the calamity. The tragedy consists in the fact that while we feel and see and know it Rāma is ignorant and unbelieving. Husband and wife are once again left to themselves. They breathe freely and close to one another. Sītā is exhausted. "Ever rely on me, I shall make you happy. What? Looking for a pillow? Poor dear, here's Rāma's arm. That's your pillow and that's your privilege, yours and yours alone." (I-37). There Sītā falls asleep in a minute. On Rama's arm! How ironically symbolic! The arm that won her love, the arm that promised her protection and the same arm, as we know in the story, that is going to cast her away! Rāma himself recognises this irony later on in Act II where he is to kill a Śūdra for being a Śūdra and practising penance at the same time. "You are the hand of that Rāma" he coaxes his trembling hand, "of that Rāma who was cruel enough to send into exile his Sītā who was in a delicate condition." (II-10). For the present, he is ignorant of what is coming. He is lovingly looking into the soft, innocent, beautiful eyes of Sītā sleeping on his arm. At last! he says, I *am* happy. Such love as ours comes once in a while and lucky is the man to whom it does (I-39). That Rāma should say this while the spy with the terrible news of the scandal on his lips is actually standing at the door is indeed the limit of the cold, calculating cruelty of the Fates.

Lest the dull-witted might miss this cruelty the author has used a device (technically known as *patākā-sthāna*) where the last word used by Rāma viz., *virahāḥ*, 'separation,' is syntactically connected with the first word viz., *upasthitaḥ* ('arrival') announcing the spy. ('Separation has arrived' is the complete sentence-idea.) The effect is as cruel as waking a man from sleep and then stabbing him. The shadow that was looming so large is now too near and Rāma, feeling uncomfortable from the very beginning, bursts out. The poet is too artistic to leave it at that. As Sītā gets on the chariot which she thinks is taking her for a pleasure-trip (and which we know is going to cast her away) she asks the charoteer to be careful since something stirs within her (*sphurati me garbha-bhārah*, my womb throbs). Finally, not realising the unkindness that is visited on her, she salutes in all innocence the deities of Rāma's family (*namo raghu-kula-dēvatābhyah*). Lucky for these deities that the curtain drops immediately.

(We have dealt with the 'touch' in the first Act since it sets the problem before us as the dramatist wants us to see it. There are other situations introduced, as for example, Rāma's coming to Pāñcavati (II), Sītā's arrival there under Tamasā's protection and the divine arrangement of Sītā not being perceived by anyone else (III), the meeting of Rāma with Lava and Kuśa who, he has a psychological presentiment, are probably his sons (VI) : in such situations which the dramatist brings in as illustrations there is a presentation, an interpretation or an 'atmosphere.' By such scenes which are as if intimately known to us we are taken to the world of the characters themselves. Thus in Act III is the episode of an elephant that twelve years ago was Sītā's pet. He is known as the adopted son of Sītā. "Oh, how my child has grown!" says Sītā. Rāma (who, of course, is unaware of Sītā though she can hear and see him) talks, as if, to Sītā, "You are lucky, my dear, since your child is now grown to a marriageable age." Sītā is now a mother—suffering motherhood incarnate—when she says, "let my son be not separated from his beloved." Every father and every mother at every home at any time has the same sentiments; so the audience is at once intimate with the characters and the situation. Sītā laughs through her tears as she confesses to her friend Tamasā "look, my motherly milk is flowing." There's my child and there's his father and being so near them I feel, for a moment, as if I am a lady of the house" (*samsārīṇī iva sarīrvyūtā*). It is in this new atmosphere of mature love and its

responsibilities that we are asked to see and judge Rāma and Sītā. Rāma may be a very foolish husband, but surely he is a good father. And what man is not great who has a feeling heart? "There is only one sentiment, the sentiment of feeling. It assumes different forms of expression according to the difference in circumstances; just as water, called an eddy or a bubble or a wave, is water in essence." In this last verse of Act III Bhavabhūti has given us a beautiful definition of tragedy. Aristotle's idea of catharsis, of evoking emotions in the audience, is seen here with a better insight. Feelings must be noble if they are to be interpreted by a great artist; the artist must be great if he is to analyse and interpret the world of feelings. Bhavabhūti has done it in a masterly way and let us say with Tamasā (at the end of Act III).

aho saṁvidhānakam, "What a grand piece of Art!" Drama is the mirror of the ways of Man.)

CHAPTER XIX

EPICS AND SANSKRIT DRAMA

In the final stages of the development of the Sanskrit drama the most noteworthy feature is the influence of the two epics—more especially as source of the story-plots of the later dramas. With plays like those of Bhavabhūti, we definitely see the best and the last. Though it could be expected that many a drama was written after the age of Bhavabhūti, it could be said with as much certainty that plays in Sanskrit not only ceased to be the fashion but also ceased to be standard plays. In a later place, we shall see the causes that led finally to the decay of the Sanskrit drama. Here it is enough to note that in the post-Bhavabhūti period Sanskrit plays continued just enough to exhibit the symptoms of decadence and deterioration. However, as suggested above, the one thing to strike even a casual observer was the influence of the epics, Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata. Murāri, a dramatist in the middle of the 9th century, rightly observes :—

aho sakala-kavi sārtha-sādhārāṇī khalu iyaṃ Vālmīkiyā
subhāṣitānīvī.

“How this good composition of Vālmīki has become the joint-stock capital for all writers-merchants?”

Even from the earliest days, as a matter of fact, we could see that the epics were an inspiration to Sanskrit dramatists. In the plays ascribed to Bhāsa, we have one-act plays based on the episodes from Mahābhārata while Bālacharita, Abhiṣeka, and Pratimā are based on the Rāma-story. Later we find Bhavabhūti writing two plays, Mahāvīracarita and Uttararāmacarita, based on the same story. What is further striking is the fact that both the dramatists, within the compass of their respective plays, narrate the complete story of the Rāmāyana—including the first and later (interpolated) sections of the epic. Secondly, as already suggested, Bhāsa and Bhavabhūti have shown their greatness by daring to introduce changes in and interpretations of the story as handed down by the epic tradition. As a matter of fact, between Bhāsa and Bhavabhūti, on the one hand, and later writers of Rāma-plays on the

other, the difference that we find is exactly the story of the deterioration of the dramatic art in Sanskrit literature. Bhāsa and Bhavabhūti, have dramatised the episodes from the Rāmāyaṇa while later dramatists—we shall have to call them so, at least by courtesy—have simply narrated, rewritten the Rama-story in the *campū* style and within Puranic atmosphere.

As examples of this later style, let us look at the three plays (1) *Kundamālā* by Dinnāga, (2) *Anargha-Rāghava* by Murāri and *Prasanna-Rāghava* by Jayadeva. The first, K. M., belongs to a period, as could be seen from a closer comparison, immediately after Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti; the A. R., as already mentioned, belongs to the ninth century A.D.; and the third, the Pras. R., is as late as the third quarter of the fifteenth century A.D. Of these three, the K.M. deals with the latter part of Rāma's story, beginning, where Act I of Bhavabhūti's U.R. ends, with Lakṣmaṇa leading Sītā to the forest before abandoning her. In Act I, the abandoned queen of Rāma, is reported to Vālmīki by his pupils and Vālmīki, making use of his *yogacakṣus* now, finds Sītā innocent and therefore decides to take her to his Ashrama. In the *praveśaka* of the next Act (which takes us to a period of eight to ten years after Act I) the birth of Sītā's twins (who are now studying Rāmāyaṇa—abālau sam-*vṛttau*—they have ceased to be children) is reported and it is also mentioned that Rāma, initiating the performance of a sacrifice at Naimiṣa, has sent a messenger to invite Vālmīki. It is very strange that important episodes are thus casually disposed off while the main scene is taken up by a dialogue between Sītā and Vedavatī wherein all that Sītā says is that she loves Rāma and knows that Rāma loves her. In Act III Sītā, her two sons, (though they themselves do not know that she is their mother) and also Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa have all assembled in the Naimiṣa forest. The main scene is the title scene wherein as Rāma is wandering with his brother the *kundamālā*, wreath of Kunda flowers woven by Sītā, is carried by the breeze and drops at Rāma's feet who immediately recognises the design of Sītā's hands. The two brothers, now like two detectives, follow up the clues till they see female foot-prints on which they conclude that Sītā must be there. What is still more ridiculous, Rāma is keen to find out where Sītā, a wife abandoned years ago, stays. In Act IV, the interlude tells us of an intended recitation-show of Rāmāyaṇa in which Tilottamā is to play the rôle of Sītā. We are also informed that Vālmīki has

a pond in and around which women-folk could not be seen by men. So in the main scene Rāma is somehow dragged by the dramatist to this pond where Sītā also comes. Sītā could see her husband, though, owing to Vālmīki's yogic stage-setting so to say, Rāma could not see Sītā. Only in one respect the dramatist has shown his imaginative skill. Though the actual Sītā could not be seen, her image in the waters could be seen by Rāma. However, when later on, the Vidūṣaka tells Rāma that Tilottamā is to play Sītā's rôle, poor Rāma thinks to his chagrin that the image he saw must have been that of Tilottamā in Sītā's rôle. The last two Acts just describe the recitation of Rāmāyana by Lava and Kuśa, who, at the end, are revealed to Rāma as his own sons. At the end Sītā has to go through the ordeal to prove her innocence. That done, Rāma accepts his wife, Kuśa is crowned as King and Lava as the heir-apparent.

As we read the play we are not struck so much by any greatness of the dramatist as we are reminded of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti. The more we read the play the more we feel that some youngish admirer of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti has tried to make a play by putting together different pieces from the works of those two dramatists. The main scene in the very first act opens like that in A.Śāk. with a similar description of the moving chariot. Sītā's speech in Act I reminds us of Kālidāsa's verse in Raghuvamśa in the same context. (Raghu. XIV-65) Throughout the play Dinnāga's verses betray a very strong influence of the poetry of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti. *What is more interesting is the presence of a Vidūṣaka friend of Rāma.* This Vidūṣaka is attempted to be created in the very image of the Vidūṣaka in the A.Śāk. Like Kālidāsa's Duṣyanta Dinnāga's Rāma asks his Vidūṣaka in Act V.

Rāma :—If you think Sītā worthy enough to be still remembered why did you not prevent me when I decided to abandon her? Throughout the play the shadow of Bhavabhūti's masterpiece, the U. R., is clearly discernible. Phrases, sentences, lines of verses, stage-devices—there is no aspect of the dramatic art where the stern southern Brahmin has not held Dinnāga bound in awe and admiration. And even the Dinnāga does not claim our admiration. Vālmīki who is a poet and an artist to Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti is just a tradition-bound orthodox-minded elderly priest in Kundamālā. Sītā who has her own individuality in Raghuvamśa and Uttararāmacarita is, to Dinnāga, no more than a conventional

housewife. Drama, instead of an art of the stage, is a dialogue-book of the class-room. The story of Rāmāyaṇa appeals to Dīn-nāga not for its dramatic qualities but for its moral lesson.

Anargha-Rāghava of Murāri, on the other hand, is a more ambitious play. Within seven acts it covers the entire story of Rāmāyaṇa. As in K.M., here also there is more poetry to describe the conventional time, day, season, and other objects than is relevant in a drama. The drama is almost a poetic composition with 567 verses. In the Viṣkambhaka of Act II, for example, six verses describe dawn, four more describe the morning and then in the main scene Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa recite 14 verses to describe Viśvāmitra's hermitage. In the last act where victorious Rāma is returning to Ayodhyā seated in the *puṣpaka* plane, Rāma, pointing to the earth below as the plane flies, describes the various countries, rivers, mountains etc.; he even talks of the *Vaidarbhi* style in poetry. And then his 'asides' to Sītā, where he mostly talks about *viparīta-rati*, *puṇyāyīla* etc., are sheer abominations. The play is one of the best examples of the degradation to which Sanskrit language and the art of drama had sunk. When at the end (VII-146) he talks of his drama as a poem (*kavitā*) and says that it would please people we feel like pitifully patting Murāri on his back and ask him to read more and write less.

The third play, Prasanna-Rāghava of Jayadeva, is no better. He himself offers a kind of an apology by making, in the opening scene, the Actor ask the Manager as to why all poets write only about Rāmachandra. It is true. By the fifteenth century when Jayadeva lived every writer was writing only about the story of Rāmāyaṇa. So Jayadeva also narrates the same story in seven acts. As a matter of fact, by this time, not only the incidents but even the course of the various acts seem to have been fixed. The breaking of the bow, the defeat of Paraśurāma, the slaughter of Vālī, the achievements of the monkey-chiefs, the battle between Rāma and Rāvaṇa, (always off the stage and described by two Vidyādhara) all these mechanically, monotonously unroll before us, brightened up here and there by the feverish poetic effusions of the dramatists. The pity of it is, the better the poetry the more out of place it would appear. Jayadeva, has in addition, tried puns (one of them is proverbially famous even to-day¹), scenes

1. *nakṣatrakuśalo bhavān* (also *na kṣatrakuśalo bhavān*)

like Rāvaṇa suddenly becoming a Rākṣasa with ten faces (I), of the fire in Sītā's hand suddenly changing into a signet ring (VI); and in the last act five characters, who have actually nothing else to do, describe the evening, in turns, in nineteen verses. But the play is not yet over, as Rāma's aeroplane is still on its way to the capital. The evening passes, night wears off and then the morning sun is described before the audience is permitted to disperse.

In most of these later Rāma plays one motive, common to all these dramatists, is obvious. We have seen how each dramatist makes a reference to the popularity of Rāma stories with writers on the whole. The reason for this popularity we do find as we read carefully through the plays. In the K.M. in the very first act Rāma is referred to as *Madhusūdāna* (in spite of the clear anachronism). In III-14 the dramatist speaks of *Rāmābhikāno Hariḥ, Hari* (God) called Rāma. In Pras R. we have a line which reads *bālātmanā parinataḥ puruṣaḥ purāṇaḥ* the primeval puruṣa in the form of a boy (IV-45) in which words *Paraśurāma* describes Rāma, his conqueror. The poor dramatic quality seems to have been fully compensated for by the fact that the play described the glories of God. In other words, drama as drama did not interest the writer, nor, apparently, did it interest the audience. These dramatic compositions were more of sacred literature than an art, which, according to Kālidāsa, pleased people of different tastes or which, as Bhāsa mentions in his Prat., was staged in palaces as mere entertainment. As if knowing this, the dramatist very scrupulously but superficially followed the rules laid down in books on dramaturgy. Thus *Dinnāga*, in his K.M., makes every act end with a verse which gives a conventional description of the time of the day. Similarly, we find in these plays devices like *praveśaka* and *viṣkambhaka* though as in the A.R., III a *viṣkambhaka* describes and deals with more and important episodes than the main scene. Similarly in the Pras.R., the whole of Act IV is more of the nature of an interlude than an act in the play. Where drama is a religious recitation, it is but natural to have a dozen verses at a stretch (and in long metres) describing anything that the dramatist fancied for the moment. That incidents could be so united as to produce a dramatic atmosphere never struck these writers who were narrating incidents that were too well-known. From the fifth Veda, common to all castes, as Bharata had visualised it, drama deteriorated into what were later known as *bhajan melās*.

In these circumstances it would not surprise us if some honest soul, giving up all this make-believe, utilised drama purely for the purpose of religion or philosophy (in an age of decadence one cannot be distinguished from the other). And so we find a play called *Prabōdha Candrōdaya*, the rise of the moon, (in the form) of knowledge by one *Kṛṣṇamiśra Yati*. This is purely a play where the traditional schools of philosophy have been discussed on their merits. All the characters that appear are mythical or abstract conceptions like *Vivēka*, *Mahāmoha*, *Nivṛtti*, *Pravṛtti*, *Cārvāka*, *Śraddhā*, *Śānti*, *Upaniṣad*, *Prabōdhōdaya* etc.

Prabōdhacandrōdaya is a play in six acts. In act I after the usual introduction *Kāma* (God of love) and *Rati* (his wife) appear in a prologue where the former gives to the audience a synopsis of the story. The main story opens with king *Discrimination* (*viveka*) and his queen *Understanding* (*mati*.) The king desires, and the queen consents, that he should take as his consort *Upaniṣad-Devi* (Lady *Upaniṣad*) that a son *Prabōdha*—Awakening—may be born. Act II takes us to the enemy's camp, so to say. Curiously enough *Bénares Pundits* get a scathing criticism (II-1) where wicked men like *Dambha* and *Ahamkāra* (Arrogance and Vanity) conspire to prevent the birth of *Prabōdha*. When *Śraddhā* (Faith) is trying to bring together king *Viveka* and lady *Upaniṣad*, *Mithyādrṣṭi* (false understanding) the wife of *Mahāmoha* (Great Ignorance) is set on her; at the same time *Śānti*, (peace) *Śraddhā's* daughter, is to be killed by felons' like *Krōdha* (Anger) and *Lōbha* (Avarice) etc. Act III takes us to a different world altogether. If the *Pundits* of *Benares* are condemned as immoral hypocrites, *Buddhists* and *Jainas* and *Kāpālikas* get no better treatment either. The scene where the *Buddhist* and *Jaina* monks, in a drunken orgy, exhibit a lascivious desire for the *Kāpālika* is brutally hilarious. The three *Bohemians* decide to abduct *Sāttvikā Śraddhā* (Pure faith) who is supposed to be living in the company of one *Viṣṇubhakti* (Devotion in God *Viṣṇu*). In Act IV *Śraddhā* herself is rescued by *Viṣṇubhakti* while the king sends soldiers to destroy those felons. The battle is described in Act V and at the end the *Buddhists* are driven out of *India*; and so the play moves on to the last act where Lady *Upaniṣad*, who describes her stay with *Yajñavidyā* (the lore of sacrifice) with *Mimāṃsā* (Ritual Science) and with *Tarkavidyā* (Logic), is brought to the king and the birth of *Prabōdha* is announced. After all the learned and philosophical quest for awaken-

CHAPTER XX

THE END

In studying the history of drama in Sanskrit literature, one could safely come to the conclusion that immediately after the age of Bhavabhūti Sanskrit Drama came to an end. It is true that long after Bhavabhūti plays were written in Sanskrit and for a still longer period a few plays in prakṛt also are to be found. But, from the examples of such plays, as seen in the fore-going chapter, our main conclusion is actually re-inforced. It is not so surprising that plays in Sanskrit language discontinued. What is really as significant as surprising is the fact that the very drama as a literary form suddenly disappeared and disappeared for good. Upto a century ago, no modern Indian language had any dramatic literature. And today when the various Indian languages are showing an alround literary development, modern drama unlike modern poetry, cannot be traced to any traditional form (except of course the renderings of half-a-dozen classical Sanskrit dramas).

1. In an earlier place (Chap. VII) we suggested that the dramatic form of literature was not germane to the culture of the Aryans. The very religious-mindedness of the early Aryans prevented them from enjoying a dramatic representation. For a long time Sanskrit language could not be used for secular subjects; and by the time Sanskrit language could be used for popular literature, Sanskrit had ceased to be the language of the people.

2. Secondly, Sanskrit drama, from its earliest days, belonged to the kings and the rich peoples. Bhāsa, in his *Pratimā*, tells us how dramatic performances were palace-entertainments. In the plays of Sri Harṣa, though they are performed, as the *Sūtradhāra* tells us, during the festivals, these festivals are not so much public occasions, as celebrations within the regions of the palace. Probably the fact that most of the Sanskrit plays have their scenes laid within the four walls of the palace is a corollary of this very situation. It is true that Bharata talks of drama as *sārvavarṇika*; but it is doubtful if the available literary dramas answered the democratic condition of Bharata. Even when Kālidāsa speaks *nāṭyaṃ bhinnarūper janasya bahudhā apī ekaṃ samārādhanam* (nāṭya as the com-

mon entertainment of the people of different tastes), the context makes us wonder if by *nāṭya* Kālidāsa means dance and not dramatic performance. Even if *nāṭya* were to mean a dramatic performance, in Kālidāsa's opinion it was a *common entertainment to various people* and not an *entertainment of common people*. That even in modern days dramas in Bengal originated under the patronage and within the four walls of the mansions of rich people seems to be a genuine relic of tradition. Sanskrit drama did not belong to the people. And as the Aryan tradition was conveyed through Sanskrit and as Sanskrit gradually became merely the language of the learned, Sanskrit dramas could not make an appeal to the common man.

3 It should be remembered, in this connection, that from the days of Aśoka Buddhism (and probably Jainism), like Puritanism, in England, definitely and deliberately discouraged popular entertainments. There was a time, after the Gupta Era, when Buddhism (as illustrated by king Śrī Haṛṣa) once again became the fashion of the court and the passion of the *savants*: more so in the north. This accounts for the fact of more plays being found mainly in southern versions. Between the revival of Buddhism and Śankara's triumphant war against Buddhism on an all-India front the interval was too short to encourage dramatic literature. And for a few centuries after Śankara, the poets and pundits and even the public, dazzled by that philosopher's brilliance, could see nothing else. By the time every thinking Hindu was *nāyā*-minded, the Muslim invasions began with devastating results.

4 The *élite* of Hindu society, for reasons mentioned above, was no longer interested in dramatic or any other kind of secular literature. Though Sanskrit drama never belonged so much to the common man, we would be wrong in believing that the common man had no dramas of his own. Tradition of the Indian stage gives us an idea of the type of plays that existed before and after and in spite of Kālidāsa. As time went on the earlier traditional heroes like Vikrama, Udayana, Duṣyanta, etc., must have become absolute strangers to the common man. And we do find that even the few Sanskrit dramatists of the later period have ceased to write about such hero-kings. The one story that was known all over the country down to the commonest man was the story of Rāmāyaṇa and so we find every dramatist repeating that story retaining (almost standardising) all the popular elements of myth and superstition.

This is one of the explanations for the fact that the Rāma plays were written in monotonous repetition by so many dramatists. It is only after the tenth century A.D. that, for the first time after Bhāsa, we come across a few plays based on the story of the other epic viz., the Mahābhārata. Such are the plays, the Bālabhārata of Rajasekhara, the Subhadrā-Dharmajaya of Kulasekharavarma-bhūpāla, and Dūtāngada by Subhata etc. The fact that most of the later Sanskrit dramatists belong to the south is significant enough. The two epics, as could be seen from some Dravidian literature, were now being popularised in the south. And the Muslim invasions of the north made the south of India the inevitable champion of ancient Aryan culture and tradition.

5. That even as late as the 15th century A.D., plays could be written in Sanskrit is in itself an eloquent evidence of the decay and death of Sanskrit drama. Sanskrit had long ceased to be the language of the people. Even the respect with which Sanskrit was compulsorily listened to seems to have abated. In the one Prākṛt play available to us viz., the Karpūramāñjari, the author, Rājasekhara, tells us almost as much in the prologue where he is explaining why he writes an all-prākṛt play.

paruṣaḥ saṁskṛita-guṇaḥ prākṛta-guṇaḥ pi bhavati
sukumāraḥ | puruṣa-mahilānām yāvadiha antaram tēsu tāvat
(I—8 ; Sanskrit rendering)

“Sanskrit phrases are harsh indeed, prākṛt phrases are sweet (and sonorous). The difference between the two is the difference between (the style of) a man and a woman.”

But as we read the prākṛt play we are struck by another fact which made the decay of such dramas (Sanskrit or prākṛt) inevitable. The Karpūramāñjari is called a sātaka i.e. prākṛt play with no prologues or interlogues. The whole play is divided into four scenes (javanikāntara). In the first scene, (1) the king and queen describe the spring season, (2) the Vidūṣaka and the palace-maid indulge in mutual abuses couched in phrases with a farfetched sense, and (3) a kṛpālikabhairavānanda performs magic by the power of which he brings the heroine. The scene ends with the description of sunset. In scene (ii) all the usual sickening description of love-lorn condition and of standardised excursions is found and the scene ends, once again, with the description of sunset. In the third scene the king and his jester narrate their dreams, after

which Karpūramañjarī, the heroine, appears on the stage; a clandestine meeting of the king with her is arranged and the scene ends with the description of rising moon. In the last scene in spite of the queen's strong guard, the king succeeds in seeing the heroine with whom he is ultimately married through the help of the Kāpālīka Bhairavānanda.

If we expected that Rājasekhara, because he wrote all in Prākṛt, would write an original style we would be completely disappointed. Tradition has been too strong for all these writers; as a matter of fact, traditional rules of dramaturgy had such sway that it was easier for an *n*'th rate author, following these rules, to write a strictly 'correct' play than for a genuine artist to write successfully in an original style. Dramas, paying more attention to traditional items of description, had deteriorated to poems punctuated either by description in prose or by incidents of love-intrigue. The beginning, the end, the incidents, the stage-devices, the sentiments, the objects of description—nay almost every detail of a Sanskrit play was so fixed by rules of dramaturgy that except in the names of the author, the title and the characters, one play could not be effectively distinguished from another play. No wonder then that only Rāma-plays became popular because there at least you acquired the merit of having witnessed God's own doings.

6. And so it came about that the religious-mindedness of the Aryans, which once did not encourage drama, did now discourage it ultimately to its final decadence. The Aryan religion, never involving communal worship, was least likely to encourage dramatic performances. It was later, after the 10th century A.D. when the Bhakti doctrine was revived and communal worship and religious festivals came into vogue that religion was partly responsible for the revival of drama. But that was the standardised Rāma-play. It took centuries and centuries before the artist could successfully rebel against doctrinaire or religious dramas (yātrā) and make drama once again the dream of Bharata, viz. a mirror of 'the doings of the world' (loka-carita), of the aspiration of Kālidāsa—viz. 'a common entertainment to persons of different tastes,' or lastly, the boast of Bhavabhūti, viz. :

"Subtle representation of different emotions; actions, pleasing and intimate; deeds of love and adventure leading along a line; lively dialogues and clever speech." (MM 1. 4).

APPENDIX

CĀRUDATTA AND MṚCHHAKAṬĪKA

Since the discovery of plays that have been ascribed to Bhāsa (Bhāsanāṭaka cakra) the authorship of the Mṛchhakaṭikam has become a more complicated problem. Sūdraka has been described as the author of the Mṛchhakaṭika in the prologue but the three verses in which his description occurs become, by their very style, liable to suspicion as regards the authenticity of their contents. (1) Firstly, in 1—3 Sūdraka is described as Dvijamukyatama. (2) Secondly, in 1—5 he is described as a Kṣitipāla, and (3) lastly, in all the three verses he is mentioned in the past tense. Add to these the fact that he is mentioned as having lived for 100 years and ten days and then immolated himself, the whole description becomes fantastic. If the Sūtradhāra himself is so uncertain about the author, it would not be unjustified on our part to hold that Sūdraka could not be the author of this play.

And then we come across a play called (Daridra) Cārudattam ascribed to Bhāsa and first published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series. The published play is in four acts. One of the two Mss., as the editor mentions, has the colophon avacitam Cārudattam. But it is obvious to any one going through the four acts that the play could not end there. The Mṛch. has ten acts. The hero and the heroine are united in act V. From this one could expect the Cār. to contain at least one act more to make the story complete. However, no Ms. gives the V act; on the other hand, as mentioned above, one, out of two Mss., shows that the play (Cār.) ended with the fourth act.

Whether originally the Cār. had more than four acts, there is no evidence from any source. This in itself would make all criticism irrelevant; a comparison of the Cār. with the Mṛch. would be inconclusive. However, even with the available four acts the close similarity between two plays is very striking as not only the story and the development but even words and verses are common. When the author of the Mṛch. is not definitely known to the Sūtradhāra of that very play and when there is such an almost word-to-word similarity with the Cār. the temptation to believe that the latter was the source of and earlier than the Mṛch. would appear justified. At present, the general opinion is that Bhāsa, an earlier dramatist, wrote the Cār. and a later writer either completed it or copied it as Mṛchhakaṭika.

In fairness to those who hold this view, let it be said that they are the first to realise many an objection against that view. For one thing, if there are only four acts in the Cār. (and the story is not complete there) what reasons can we find that made Bhāsa leave the play unfinished? Secondly, if the Mṛchhakaṭikam is only a completion of the Cār. how is it that from the very first act we find not only significant

deviations but too many verbal changes and different lines or sometimes *entirely different verses themselves*? If, on the other hand, the *Mṛchhakaṭikā* is modelled on the *Cār* how is it that a dramatist who could write and write well six independent acts could not write the first four without copying freely from the *Cār*? As long as these two questions could not be answered satisfactorily, we shall not be justified in supporting the generally held view

To begin with, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to explain why *Bhāsa* should have left the *Cārudatta* unfinished. That the play is unfinished there is no doubt about it. Even as the fourth act ends we are left with the expectation of the heroine going to meet the hero. Moreover, *durdina* (the stormy day) that is described in act V of the *Mṛchhakaṭikā* is referred to by the *Ceṭi* before the fourth act of *Cārudatta* ends. Just a little before that, when the heroine informs the *Ceṭi* about the love-episode of *Sajjalika* and *Madanikā* ending in their marriage, the *Ceṭi* says :—*Priyam me amṛtāṅka nāṭakam samvṛttam*. It is a very curious and unusual remark which, on second thoughts makes us wonder if it is not a criticism of the other play viz the *Mṛchhakaṭikā*. Before we hazard an opinion on this, let us review more carefully the so-called close resemblances in the two plays.

When we remember that the *Cārudatta* is available only in its first four acts we obviously expect that it would not contain the sub-plot of the revolution against king *Pālaka*. This sub-plot is fully developed only in the last five acts of the *Mṛchhakaṭikā*. But it is strange why the fifth act is not available in *Cārudatta* though that act only describes the meeting of the hero with the heroine. The *Cārudatta* not only does not contain the sub-plot as developed in the last acts of the *Mṛchhakaṭikā* but even the casual references to it in the earlier acts of the *Mṛchhakaṭikā* are not to be found in the *Cārudatta*. Thus in the prologue of the *Mṛchhakaṭikā*, the *Sūtradhāra* getting angry with *Ummavṛdha* says :—*Ah dasyāḥ putra Cūmavṛdha kaḍā nu khalu tvām kupitena rājā Pālakena navavadhūkeśakalāpamiva saugandha chhedyamānam prakṣyate*. In the *Cārudatta*, however, only that context in the prologue is not to be found and hence there is no reference to the king *Pālaka*. The gambler's scene in *Mṛchh. II* is entirely absent in the *Cār*. Here also, among other things, there is a reference to the subplot *Dardurakāḥ* :—*Kathitam ca mama priyavayasya Śarvilakena yathā kula Āryakanāmā Gopāladārakāḥ Sidhā-desena samāvṛṣṭa rājā śravṣyateeti*. Similarly, in *Mṛchh. III* the hero tells us that it was one *rebhila* who gave the music performance. This *rebhila* (act IV, *Mṛchh.* is mentioned as the friend of *śarvilaka* also. But in the *Cār*, we are told that it was *śābala* who gave the music performance. From all this, it appears as if the *Cār* is making a studious effort to eschew all references to the sub-plot of the revolt of *Āryaka*.

The omission of the gambler's scene in the *Cār* suggests another possibility as could be verified by other examples. The gamblers' scene, as shown in the *Mṛchh.*, has that peculiar stage technique which is represented throughout the play. Besides an apartment of *Vasantasenā*

that is revealed at the opening of the act, we go over the open road, a temple, a crowd scene and then we follow the Śarvilaka running and finally into Vasantaenil's apartment. The change of scene is avoided in the Cār. Not only here, but even in other places where the Mṛchh. changes the scene, the Cār. does not. Even in act I, except the change of the heroine by Śakūta, the Cār. shows a changeover by introducing the scene between a verse by the hero and his mention of the sleeping hero—the idea of the verse and the offering act in all being related as they are in the Mṛchh. Similarly in act IV all those changes of scene where Madanika meets Śarvilaka and where the Vidyaka pass through many apartments are entirely omitted in the Cār.

In spite of the 'almost word-for-word' resemblance, the variations appear to be really more significant. The more we analyse functions, the more obvious it appears that only two facts govern all of them: (1) the avoidance of all reference to the sub-plot, and (2) the omission of all contents involving a change of scene within the body of an act.

In another place, I have analysed all the thirteen plays ascribed to Bhāsa from the point of view of the proportion of *anugāthi* verses to the total number of verses in each play and suggested that those plays where the proportion was very low formed a distinct group of themselves and also could be clearly distinguished from those in a different group. The Cār. is one where this proportion is low (17 *anugāthi* out of a total of 55 verses). Here I carry that suggestion further by saying that the plays belonging to the group containing the Cār. are of a different and an inferior author than that of the group containing *Svapnavāsavadatta* and others. This suggestion of mine is supported by the comparison of the Cār. and the Mṛchh. as described above. That comparison shows to us the possibility of the Cār. itself being a revised or a stage-version of the Mṛchh. With the latter play before him the author of the Cār. freely used the names *nāyaka* (for Cāradatta), *Ganika* (for Vasantaenil), *Sajjalaka* (Pkt. for Śarvilaka) and so on. But as he revised the Mṛchh. the author of the Cār. must have found two things he disliked: one, a successful revolt against a reigning king and the other the sufferings of the hero and that too at the hands of the King's brother-in-law. Besides, there are scenes of apparent death of the heroine, of the death-sentence and of the execution place and of Cāradatta's wife attempting *Sati*. As the *Ceti* in act IV of Cār. says, the author of the revised version did not like any death-scenes or associations with death: he preferred an *amṛta anka-nṛtaka*. A Bhāsa who could show Duryodhana die on the stage would never put such a limitation on his art.

INDEX

- Abhiṣekanāṭaka, 75, 77, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 150.
 Acyuta, 119.
 Agastya, 30.
 Anandavardhan, 8.
 Anargha-Rāghava, 151, 153, 154.
 Arabhati, 25, 41.
 Āndhras, 88.
 Apsaras, 111.
 Ariel, 122.
 Aristophanes, 50.
 Arthaśāstra, 29.
 Āryaka, 108.
 Āryans, 28, 29, 159.
 Aśoka, 43, 44, 127.
 Āstika-Parvaṇa, 9.
 Āśvaghoṣa, 14, 76.
 Ātharvaṇa, 21, 33.
 Avimāraka, 64, 69, 80, 81, 82, 83.
 Ayodhyā, 40, 140, 153.
 Bālabhārata, 159.
 Bālacarita, 76, 78, 81, 83, 85, 150.
 Bāṇa, 73, 123.
 Bhārati, 23, 24, 25, 26, 41.
 Bhāsa, 47, 64, 65, 69, 73, 77, 79, 88, 110, 121, 150, 151, 154, 157, 159, 161, 162.
 Bhaṭṭa-Narayan, 46, 63, 74.
 Bhavabhūti, 15, 18, 40, 46, 60, 62, 70, 74, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 149, 150, 151, 152, 157, 160.
 Brahaspati, 82.
 Brāhma, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 57, 58, 111.
 Brāhmaṇas, 4, 6, 11, 18.
 Budhacarita, 14.
 Buddhism, 102, 123, 124, 127, 128, 158.
 Cāṇakya, 39, 133, 134, 138, 140, 141.
 Candragupta II, 39.
 Carlyle, 84.
 Carudatta, 64, 65, 161, 162, 163.
 Christ, 34.
 Daṇḍaka, 58, 134, 138.
 Daśarūpaka, 15, 17, 18, 53, 60, 65, 115.
 Dasyus, 30.
 Dhanañjaya, 15, 115.
 Dhanuka, 116.
 Diṇṇāga, 151, 152, 153, 154.
 Dravidian Literature, 159.
 Dūta-Ghaṭotkaca, 75, 76, 78, 87.
 Dūtāṅgadā, 159.
 Dūtavākya, 75, 83, 84, 87.
 Dūrvāśas, 57.
 Edict, 43.
 England, 34.
 Euripides, 46.
 Frogs, 50.
 Ganapati Shastri Mahamahopadhyaya, 73, 75.
 George Sāntāyana, 98.
 Girnar Rock, 43.
 Greeks, 32, 46, 51, 53, 54, 71, 72.
 Gupta Empire, 103.
 Hamlet, 98.
 Harṣa Carita, 123.
 Harṣa Sri, 43, 62, 70, 103, 122, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 135, 136, 139, 157.
 Hinduism, 87, 123.
 Indra, 111, 131.
 Jainism, 158.
 Jambudvīpa, 20.
 Jānakīharana, 14.

- Janamejaya, 38.
 Jayadeva, 44, 151, 153
 Kauski, 24, 25, 41.
 Kaṭabha, 23, 26, 33, 119
 Kālidāsa, 15, 45, 50, 54, 56, 58, 64,
 66, 67, 73, 74, 78, 88, 89, 90, 91,
 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101,
 103, 104, 108, 109, 110, 121, 122,
 124, 126, 128, 129, 133, 140, 142,
 143, 151, 152, 154, 157, 158, 160.
 Kalunga, 127.
 Karmabhāra, 75, 76, 77, 81, 87.
 Karpūramāñjari, 159, 160.
 Kautilya, 29.
 Kauśambi, 123
 Keith, Dr. A. B., 32, 37.
 Kṛṣṇa, 23, 33, 37, 75, 76.
 Kṛṣṇamuśra-Yatī, 154, 156
 Kulaśekhara-varmabhūpāla, 159
 Kumāradāsa, 14.
 Kundamālā, 151, 152, 154
 Kurukṣetra, 30.
 Kusilava, 8, 39, 40, 49, 50
 Latin, 34.
 Literature, 3
 Lomaharṣaṇa, 9
 Madhu, 23, 33, 119.
 Madhusūdan, 154.
 Madhyamavyāyoga, 75, 77, 80, 81.
 Magadha, 9, 10.
 Mahābhārata, 5, 6, 12, 15, 16, 37,
 38, 39, 40, 55, 75, 77, 87, 133,
 134, 138, 141, 150, 159
 Mahāvīracanta, 46, 133, 134, 138,
 Maheśwara-yoga 82.
 Mālatī-Mādhava, 40, 46, 58, 59, 60,
 70, 132, 133, 136, 138, 139.
 Mālavikāgnimitra, 43, 55, 57, 58,
 60, 67, 69, 70, 73, 78, 89, 90,
 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 108, 124.
 Manu, 29, 82.
 Meurvan Empire, 10, 102.
 Medhapatī, 82.
 Mīmāṃsa, 4.
 Mṛchakatika, 40, 46, 49, 61, 65, 66, 101, 104, 108, 109, 110, 121,
 161, 162, 163.
 Mudrā-Rākṣasa, 39, 46, 50, 61, 132,
 138, 139, 140.
 Murāri, 150, 153.
 Nāgānand, 62, 122, 123, 124, 125,
 129, 130.
 Nahusa, 28, 29, 30, 35, 44
 Naimiṣa, 9
 Nārada, 21.
 Nirukta, 4, 11.
 Pañcatantra, 73, 79, 81, 82, 86
 Pañcaviṭṭi, 58, 139, 148
 Pāṇini, 73, 74, 76, 77
 Paraśurāma, 153, 154.
 Paurāṇika, 38
 Piyadāsi, 43.
 Poet, 3.
 Prabodha-Candrōdaya, 153, 156
 Prācetasā, 82.
 Prākṛt, 16, 17, 91, 101, 159, 160
 Praśanna-Rāghava, 44, 151, 153,
 154
 Pratijñā-Yaugandharāyaṇa, 64, 75,
 81, 85
 Pratimā, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84,
 85, 86, 150, 154, 157.
 Priyadarśikā, 122, 123, 124, 125,
 126, 127, 129, 131
 Prospero, 122.
 Punjab, 30
 Puritanism, 158
 Puruṣāyita, 153.
 Puṣpaka, 153
 Raghuvamśa, 142, 152.
 Rg. 21, 23, 24, 28, 33
 Rājāśekhara, 73, 159, 160
 Rajputāna, 44.
 Rāmāyaṇa, 5, 6, 12, 15, 39, 40, 46,
 75, 76, 133, 134, 141, 150, 151,
 153, 158
 Ratnāvalī, 43, 49, 62, 70, 122, 123,
 124, 125, 126, 129, 131
 Ravana, 153, 154

- Sāhitya-Darpaṇa, 18, 47, 53, 60, 65, 115, 121.
 Sākhya, 158.
 Sattvati, 24, 25, 26, 41.
 Sauti, *see* suta.
 Scythians, 88.
 Shakespeare, 29, 87.
 Śrī, 21, 112, 135.
 Subhadrā-Dhanañjaya, 159.
 Subhāṣa, 159.
 Śudraka, 18, 46, 61, 74, 101, 105, 110, 121, 133, 161.
 Sūta, 8, 9, 10, 38, 39, 41, 45, 52.
 Sūtra, 4, 6.
 Svapnavāsavadattā, 54, 64, 65, 66, 68, 75, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 95.
 Taṇḍu, 112, 113.
 Tilottamā, 151, 152.
 Trivendrum Sanskrit Series, 73, 74, 161.
 Ujjain, 44, 46.
 Upaniṣads, 4, 6, 11, 15, 18, 73.
 Uttaraśāstrīya, 40, 46, 57, 58, 59, 132, 134, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 150, 152.
 Urubhaṅga, 75, 76, 78, 87, 121.
 Vaidarbhi, 153.
 Vaiśampāyana, 12.
 Vasiṣṭha, 145, 146.
 Vāli, 153.
 Vālmīki, 9, 39, 58, 144, 151, 152.
 Vedāṅgas, 4.
 Vedic Hymns, 3, 4, 11, 15.
 Veni-Sambhāra, 45, 50, 63.
 Vikramorvaśīyam, 55, 57, 64, 67, 89, 90, 93, 98, 121.
 Vindhyas, 30.
 Viparītaratī, 153.
 Viśakhadatta, 61, 74, 132, 133, 135, 138, 139.
 Viṣṇu, 75.
 Viśvanātha, 18, 47, 60, 75, 115.
 Vyāsa, 9, 16.
 Yajurveda, 11, 21, 24, 33.
 Yama, 141.
 Yāska, 11.